

**Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 26 May 2011 at 10am in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.**

**Present:**

**Members:**

Kit Malthouse (Chairman), Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman)  
Tony Arbour, Jennette Arnold, John Biggs, Faith Boardman, Chris Boothman,  
Victoria Borwick, Valerie Brasse, Cindy Butts, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey,  
Toby Harris, Kirsten Hearn, Neil Johnson, Jenny Jones, Clive Lawton,  
Joanne McCartney, Steve O'Connell, Caroline Pidgeon, Amanda Sater and  
Graham Speed.

**MPA Officers:**

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive), Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive) and  
Bob Atkins (Treasurer).

**MPS Officers:**

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner) and Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner).

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Members, I make that 10am. If I could call you all to order please? It has been a while - welcome back - having skipped the last meeting. Before we start can we just go round the room and identify ourselves? Kit Malthouse, Chairman.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Catherine Crawford.

**Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman):** Reshard Auladin.

**Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive):** Jane Harwood.

**Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA):** Bob Atkins.

**Graham Speed (AM):** Graham Speed.

**Amanda Sater (AM):** Amanda Sater.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** Tony Arbour.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Joanne McCartney.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Valerie Brasse.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Jenny Jones.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Toby Harris.

**Chris Boothman (AM):** Chris Boothman.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Clive Lawton.

**Neil Johnson (AM):** Neil Johnson.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Kirsten Hearn.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Dee Doocey.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Caroline Pidgeon.

**Faith Boardman (AM):** Faith Boardman.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** Tim Godwin.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Paul Stephenson.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Just arrived ...?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Cindy Butts.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Great. Thank you very much. I have received apologies from Valerie Shawcross. Is there anybody else? No?

Declarations of interests. Does anybody have any interests to declare in relation to items on the agenda or generally, other than the normal list? No? Thank you.

Minutes of our meeting on 31 March 2011 are attached for Members' approval. There is a transcript on the website if you want to get into forensic detail. Caroline?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I wanted to look at 84.4.1 and 84.4.2; the answer I was given from the Deputy Commissioner, Acting Commissioner at the time, about membership of Masonic lodges. What was minuted here does not reflect that Tim [Godwin] agreed that he would go away and look into this further. That is not reflected here. It just gives comments. It needs amending because there was an action there that Tim would go away and look into this and look at whether some sort of register was appropriate.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Can we put that in the minutes? Tim, have you been going round shaking hands with lots of your officers to see what it feels like!

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** I can't say that I have, actually!

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Apparently they put their thumb on your third knuckle or something when they shake hands. That is how you know. My grandfather was a Mason so I know all about funny handshakes.

Fine. We will put that in the minutes. Thank you for that. Anything else on the minutes? No? All happy for me to sign it into history? OK. That is done.

Right. Chairman's update. Briefly then, Members. First of course I wanted to welcome back Sir Paul Stephenson. We are very pleased to see you, Commissioner, back from your break. We know how much you have been looking forward to coming back into the Chamber!

Of course congratulations are due to you and your team on the highly successful policing and security operation around the Royal Wedding - which was generally acknowledged to be a triumph both at home and internationally; everybody was very impressed and, more recently, a very successful State visit, which went off without incident, despite the President of the United States causing a flurry of activity - akin to that of when my mother in law said she was coming early for Christmas - by coming a night early. Thank you to all those officers and staff that cancelled their evening and came in to make sure he made it in safe and well, and he is now on his way, so extremely well done on that.

Several other bits of good news. Just to pick out two or three. At the end of April 2011 officers and staff took part in a charity rugby match which raised £20,000 for the Help for Heroes charity. Lewisham Police Station recently held a successful open day at which a record number of almost 1,700 people visited to find out what goes on and what police officers do at that station. On 17 May 2011 boroughs across London held community engagement activities to raise awareness around homophobia and transphobic issues, which was extremely successful.

I have attended a number of meetings since we last met - I think you have got a list attached at Appendix A. A couple of things to highlight. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill entered the House of Lords on 1 April 2011, began in Committee stage on 11 May 2011 and we are monitoring the debate closely. There have been a number of meetings with the Home Office including on the Ministerial PCC Transition Board, which is a London strand but Catherine [Crawford] chairs. I also had a meeting with the new Permanent Secretary at the Home Office and the Mayor and I met the Home Secretary earlier this week - all of which allowed us to discuss progress on the legislation.

Also, since the last Full Authority, I chaired a couple of Joint Engagement Meetings - a very interesting one with Barking and Dagenham, which John Biggs also attended, and Greenwich as well. Useful action points came out of both.

Following the Trades Union Congress (TUC) march we felt it was useful to hold a bit of a summit and a meeting with the businesses that had been impacted in central London. Business leaders, their representatives and heads of security came to the MPA, alongside the MPS, Westminster Council and other agencies concerned. We sat and had a very useful couple of hours' discussion, coming up with a number of action points. Assistant Commissioner Owens impressed everybody with her knowledge and handling of the issue but, nevertheless, we realised there were things that could be done to improve. Everybody there was very appreciative of the way the Royal Wedding was handled and an action plan was devised. Westminster Council is taking the lead, since it is its territory, but it is forming a strategic group - which will involve us and the service - in overseeing progress on the work we need to do to make sure that we reduce the amount of disruption caused by protests generally in the centre of the capital.

Earlier this month I also opened a successful consultation event here in the Chamber around stop and account where we had about 150 members of the community, 40 of whom were classified as 'young people - I don't know what that means these days - to come and talk about the stop and account form and the consultation around that. Interestingly, one of the issues that came out of it was that, without the outgoing and very positive engagement that the MPS and the MPA are doing, a lot of members of the community in London had not twigged that there was likely to be a change. The overwhelming message of that day was that people were very nervous about any changes to the stop and account regime but there is a wider consultation process taking place, including an online survey. All of that will be brought back shortly and collated and then a report brought before Members with a recommended way forward for discussion in the future.

A couple of other issues just to update you on. I met with the Chair of the Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group (CPCG) and the Borough Commander to discuss the death of David Emmanuel, otherwise known as Smiley Culture, which as you will know was an issue at the last MPA meeting.

I also met the London and South East Commissioner of the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) who is handling the investigation. He and I have exchanged correspondence confirming that until his investigation is complete he does not think it would be appropriate for us to discuss the matter here at the Police Authority. Once his investigation is complete - which he is going to try to do as swiftly as he can - then we will bring that back before Members for consideration.

Finally, at the Full Authority meeting you will remember we all voted and I agreed to write to the Home Secretary asking for a judicial inquiry into the Daniel Morgan case. I have now received the response from the Home Secretary earlier this week who stated that the MPS and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) have embarked on a review of events leading to the collapse of the trial and that the Government would review any implications for the Serious Organised Crime and Policing Act around the use of known offenders as witnesses resulting from that review.

The letter also stated that it is the Government's view that a full inquiry is currently unnecessary while that review is taking place. Again, once that review is complete, a report will be brought before Members for consideration and we can then discuss further whether we think a response is needed. We continue to liaise closely with the family to ensure that they feel fully supported and fully aware of what is going on.

That was it from me. Any questions. Jenny [Jones] and then Graham [Speed]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I was wondering if you could give us a couple of the ideas that came up at this business meeting about how to minimise disruption to businesses during demonstrations?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** There were two broad thrusts in terms of the areas for discussion. One was the sharing of information beforehand and making sure that that information was properly disseminated so, for instance, on the TUC march there were one or two premises which ended up being targeted which were not informed that they may or may not be. Also making sure that that information was two way because lots of those large corporates gather intelligence themselves around the security of their own stores and making sure that the MPS was aware of that. A full exchange of data afterwards.

The other broad area was a discussion around the real time provision of information on the day. Those West End businesses are broadly in two organisations - the New West End Company (NWEC) and what is called Heart of London - both of which are promotional organisations but also have a role in terms of security, the environment and all the rest of it. If they wanted to have observers in the control room on the day they could then promulgate information to their members much more quickly, therefore lifting the burden a bit from the police who are trying to control their own troops on the day as well.

Information sharing at the start and then what about actually happens on the day were the two broad areas.

Graham [Speed]?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. In welcoming the Commissioner back I think it would be remiss of us if we were not to note our appreciation to Tim [Godwin] and to John [Yates] and to others who acted up during that time and took on a considerable extra workload and responsibility and who did a great job in that time.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thank you. Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** I welcome the comments from you about what is going on with the David Emmanuel case. We remember that his nephew was in the Chamber at our last meeting. I do appreciate what you are saying but I think sometimes that families do appreciate contact from us repeating what is going on. We sometimes forget - we are OK

with our structures and our silos - meeting with the families to reinforce what is going on. I would ask you to consider whether or not you could do that.

The other thing is we have mentioned a number of pieces of correspondence. Will they be made available for the record? I welcome and thank you for the work that you have done on the Daniel Morgan case - who was my constituent - and all the other Members of this Authority for their continued support to that family.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I am happy to share the correspondence.

On David Emmanuel we are not the investigating authority. The IPCC has a full family liaison structure and there is a Family Liaison Officer (FLO) who is dealing with the family. We have attempted to make contact through that route but you will understand that the situation is sensitive. We have not left it. It was one of the things that I spoke to the IPCC about and the family is getting full support through its FLO structure.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** I think sometimes just a letter, if not direct contact, because they are Londoners and we are their body. There is still a question about this Authority, "What's its purpose?" It is there to represent Londoners. I do not think it can hurt; a letter from you outlining that. It can be delivered through the FLO. It is just that little bit extra that does make a difference.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I understand. Reshard [Auladin]?

**Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman):** The stop and account event was a very successful one in terms of attendance but also in terms of input from people who were contributors on the day. What has to be noted is the overwhelming support for keeping some form of recording when someone has been stopped and asked to account for themselves. People accepted that it may not be a great deal of value to the police service but for members of the public, in terms of trust and confidence, it is absolutely key. Therefore, we do need to find a way of doing something that will keep that trust and confidence, mainly because people feel that without that piece of paper - and they do not need a great deal of information on this - it would be very difficult to ascertain whether stop and account is being conducted fairly and responsibly. There has to be a debate before a decision is made as to whether we do away with this.

We know the Home Office is very keen to get rid of that recording. Other police services have already done that. We could say, genuinely, that we have consulted with the public in London and they have an overwhelming wish to keep some form of recording.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thank you. Anything else? No? OK. Thank you very much.

Moving on to the next item then if we can please which is the Commissioner's report.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you, Chairman. Good morning ladies and gentlemen. This is my first Full Authority meeting for some time. Graham [Speed], thank you for the remarks you made - exactly what I want to say as well and I am very grateful for you raising it. I want to place on record my very sincere thanks to Tim [Godwin] in particular, to John [Yates] and to the other people who did, I think, such a great job - a spectacular job in my opinion. Also, if I can publicly thank them for putting up with what, perhaps in the early days of my incarceration, were less than coherent telephone calls. You did it with great grace and I am very grateful to you, Tim. I think you did a great job.

I think I should start with the news that one of my officers, PC Nigel Albuery - whom you will be aware of - was stabbed, and that is a serious matter, in Croydon. A stark reminder of the dangers that our cops face, and police staff. I spoke with Nigel in hospital before he was released. He was in good spirits then, his condition was stabilised and he has now been released. Thankfully not as serious as it might have been but, if you are Nigel Albuery, he will think it is very serious, just like any person who has been stabbed. Other officers were affected as well of course.

Next I want to turn to the issue around one of our officers and the G20, PC Simon Harwood. I want to start by, again, echoing and repeating the comments of DSC Rose Fitzpatrick. I think she got it absolutely right on the day when the coroner's inquest gave its verdict. I think she was absolutely right and I have to say it is a matter of deep regret, irrespective of any future judicial process or disciplinary process, for a Commissioner when you get a verdict like that coming from a coroner's inquest associated with one of my officers.

I have always maintained that it was our intention to be open and transparent and now the CPS has brought summonses we will get on with working through our own internal disciplinary procedures and do that in cooperation with or in communication with the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) and IPCC.

Can I quickly turn to the Royal Wedding? Thank you for your comments, Chairman. It was a great day for London. It was a spectacular day and a great encouragement to come back for and be part of, despite the stick. The policing operation was very complex. It took 22 weeks to plan. One million visitors to central London. I am told two billion visitors worldwide. I think London and the MPS put on its best face for the day. A huge amount of work done. Led by Lynne Owens but with a lot of other people. A very, very good working background to make sure that day was a success.

I have to say I am always proud to be Commissioner and I was particularly proud to be Commissioner on that day. I was proud of what our staff did. We received lots of letters of thanks, some very grateful letters of thanks - from the Mayor, the Prime Minister, the Home Secretary, letters on behalf of the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge and many, many letters from the public.

The bottom line is, in major events, it is clearly obvious that we do not always get it right. Getting policing right for major events and getting the right amount of asset people - officers and staff - to police it appropriately is not an exact science. When we get it wrong - and we did get it wrong once at Millbank - as you might recall I am quick to come out and say, "That wasn't good enough".

I would just like to mention one thing around that - echoing something I said recently in a speech - and it is the council of perfection that we have in the media on occasions around dealing with public order work. The right to protest is a fundamental part of our democratic society but it comes with, occasionally, add ons. Citizens have a right to demonstrate peacefully and other citizens have a right to expect people to obey the law. As I said in a recent speech I agree with Shami Chakrabarti [Director, Liberty] when she said there is no such thing as a risk free society, particularly when we are trying to protect that particular value.

We have got to guard against some of the narrative that is talked about that we can have these demonstrations, guarantee no incidents on the street and the answer lies in some perfect intelligence system, because it does not. It really does not. Not unless you want the sort of State that I do not think any of us want. On occasions - and we have seen it in recent times - we do have some young people who get caught up in the event and do things that no amount of intelligence would have predicted. Certainly I and you do not want to see us trying to deploy corporate asset into sixth form common rooms trying to predict when people get it wrong. There are people who are regretting their actions now and there is one young man, famously you recall, who is now serving a term of imprisonment. No intelligence would have picked that up in advance.

I want to make the point again that we have got to get the balance in the narrative of how we deal with public disorder; us being responsible for always looking to improve and looking to be better in the way we respond but also making it clear that there is no amount of intelligence that will make it so that we can have this right to demonstrate and guarantee that there will not be some incidents. It does concern me on occasions that the narrative of perfection that we have in the media is not a realistic one and not a very helpful one.

When we did get it wrong at Millbank we know what went wrong; we did not have the right numbers of people on duty. I have told you about that before. The reason for that was over about a decade we had not seen violent protests on the streets and we were reducing the commitment. We caught a cold. We have got to learn from that.

It is one of the reasons, during a time of economic constraint and cuts that we are now facing, that we have to work - and we are working very hard - at maintaining as many police officers as we can in this city. We are different. We need a surge capability in this city to respond to the 4,500 public events we have and to respond to some extraordinary events at very short notice. You have mentioned one, Chairman, in your opening; we had a very successful visit by President Obama [President, United States of America], but he did come a day early. We need a surge capability to deal with things like that.



When Lynne Owens came into my office and told me, “We have had a tricky few weeks with a lot on. The President has come a day early”. I said, “Well, he would do wouldn’t he?” It is London. We need the surge capability to deal with that sort of thing. That is the importance of police numbers here in London that perhaps is not of the same level of importance in certain other parts of the country. It is our ambition to maintain as many as we possibly can.

I want to touch on confidence data. We have just published our end of year confidence figures in the public attitude survey. You have got some information in the report but we have had more information since then. These show encouraging progress. 66% of Londoners think their local police do a good or an excellent job and that is a 4% increase on last year. Is it where I want it to be? No. I would like it to be 100%. 66% is a significant improvement. Performance for quarter four, that is January to March 2011, was particularly encouraging with 70% of people thinking that local police did a good or excellent job compared with 64% for the same quarter in the previous year. One swallow does not make a summer but they are the sort of figures we want to see; improvements in confidence. We want to improve it still further but we are still the best in class against our other comparative forces across the country.

Turning to performance more generally, in agreement with you, we have moved to a smaller number of key performance indicators for this financial year but, to be honest, we are one month in terms of reporting into that financial year so pretty meaningless reporting on one month alone. However, as this is the first meeting of this financial year I thought I would use the opportunity to briefly touch on last year’s figures, because we have not had the chance to discuss that - the year end figures - whilst drawing out some longer term trends that are of concern.

Firstly, whilst we have seen some challenging areas, there were some pleasing outcomes from last year’s figures. Despite (inaudible) obstacles we did manage to reduce the total number of notifiable offences, recorded offences, actually by a small percentage but a big number, because we deal with big numbers here in the MPS. Almost 7,000 fewer total reported crimes.

As has been well documented that is the lowest level of crime in London since 1999, for which similar records were available. That is a real achievement but we have got to carry on going in the right direction and that is what we are intending to do. A particular achievement when you consider the demographic changes and the pressures of London over the last ten years. It is also pleasing that that reduction has continued into this very early financial year with a similar trend in reduction. Again, it is only one month old.

We have also made progress on the number of serious offences committed, with violence with injury reduced by 6.1%(?) - I prefer numbers on these things - 4,330 offences reduced. Overall gun crime down huge percentages but 759 fewer offences of gun crime and, particularly pleasingly, gun crime being discharged down. The two together paint an improving picture and an important picture for us.

Now turning to tackling serious and acquisitive crime. Knife crime and youth violence were troublesome - we know that - last year. There are issues around that that continue to be troublesome because they were the exception. The number of victims of serious youth violence was up by 81 offences. That is not where we want to be; we want to be reducing youth violence. Knife crime was up by some 723 offences, although you will recall that injury with knife was down. There is a mixed picture there but it is still a cause for concern.

You will recall that last summer knife crime and youth violence went up very significantly. We took action. Local boroughs developed bespoke action plans. We worked with lots of other agencies. That has had some impact but we are still under pressure in this early part of the year. We have got some very good crime figures but we are still under pressure in certain areas, particularly in relation to robbery offences which have been a pressure area now for us for some time, and we have taken action but it is still under pressure for us. We are also under pressure around burglary at this moment in time.

In discussion with Tim [Godwin] and with Ian McPherson [Assistant Commissioner, head of Territorial Policing] and the rest of the Management Board, whilst we have seen a number of encouraging reductions in reported crime I am concerned at those continuing pressures. I have asked Territorial Policing to ensure that there is significant asset devoted to this area. I am still working through the detail but we are going to mount a significant operation drawing resources from across the organisation from officers from Specialist Operations (SO), Central Operations (CO) and Specialist Crime Directorate (SCD) and right the way across the organisation. We have to try to make an impact on what has been a trend for a little too long now around robbery and the association with knife crime and around burglary at this moment in time. I cannot give you any more details. Territorial Policing (TP) are currently working through with the rest of the Management Board how we are going to do it. It will be significant and I will make sure there is a thorough briefing note sent round to everyone, and it will be in the next couple of weeks.

Moving on to teenage homicides. It is right that we mention it. There have been two more tragic deaths since March 2011's meeting; Negus McClean and Temidayo Fuwad Ogunneye. That takes the total so far this calendar year to six. Again, I will say what I always say; I can turn round and say that is significantly less than last year - it was ten - but it is six too many. It is just six too many. I hate doing comparative figures on this but it is significantly down. I am pleased it is down but it is still six too many.

On the budget. Together with the performance challenge we face we are having to face a significant financial challenge. We have an approved budget from you for this financial year based on delivering £163 million of savings. It is against the background of increasing service pressure. That is our job. We have got to continue to do better for less - and we understand that.

That has only started the challenge and work has now begun on developing our 2012/13 budget in the business plan. In developing our plans we are under the constraints of that significant constraint on our budget. Maintaining a balanced policing model which reflects to deal with the challenges we face when we see certain crime types is essential to ensuring our resources are allocated in the right area. Against that background, based on current available information, we are expecting to have to reduce our spending, compared to 2010/11, by some £600 million by 2014/15. That is not an insignificant task. That £600 million includes the £323 million we have already identified as to how we intend to reduce, but there is still a gap there that we have got to close and we are working very hard with Members of the Authority as to how we might do that.

We are determined to mitigate as far as practical the impact on any reductions in performance. I was saying to my Management Board the mantra has to be we must do better for less, not just manage with less. Our focus continues to be on challenging inanimate costs - which is Tim's [Godwin] phrase - delivering an effective business and operational model and only then reducing our operational officers, but my intention is to maintain operational capability.

Can I just touch on the Olympics? Quite a big challenge. We are now less than a year away from the start of the Olympic torch relay and meticulous planning continues and I am very grateful for the support we get from a number of Members of the Authority, not least yourself, Dee [Doocey]. Chris Allison [Assistant Commissioner, Central Operations] is a very, very busy man these days. He is doing a very good job but there is lots more to do.

In a way I guess the Royal Wedding showed the MPS working at its best with all business groups pulling together in a very seamless way. Whilst it was not a test in itself it was an event of enormous proportions on its own and it did serve as an opportunity to test some command and control systems for a large and multi faceted command team which will be replicated and be even more of a challenge in the Olympics.

I was very pleased by comments made by a group of the international Olympic observers who attended the day of the Royal Wedding who described the security planning for the day as flawless. I will not go any further on that. Nothing is ever flawless as far as I am concerned but it was pretty good. That is what we are looking for for the Olympics; we are looking to produce a world class security operation.

At that point, Chairman, I think I will stop.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thanks very much, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. We will move into questions if we may. With Members' permission we have had a number of questions on similar lines so I am going to group questions together. If a question has been, effectively, answered in the response to another Member's question, please do feel free to say so. We are going to start with Dee [Doocey] please?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Do you want me to read the question?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** If you wouldn't mind because it is for people who are watching on camera.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Question one is in line with the existing practice of the Mayor and the London Assembly, will you publish online for all MPS Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) officers a rolling register of all gifts and hospitality accepted, detailing the date, description and donor/provider? Will you also make this available for the last three financial years?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Yes. I will say a bit more than that; we will publish gifts and hospitality accepted by all ACPO officers on a quarterly basis and information from our Management Board Members covering the period January 2011 to March 2011 was published yesterday. We intend to publish this information, as you requested, for the last three financial years and we are currently assessing the action we need to take to do that.

Both the Deputy and I, as you know, have our hospitality registers currently examined by the MPA and the Deputy takes responsibility for examining them for the rest. They will be published.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** It is not just Management Board that is going to be published; it is all ACPO officers?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** ACPO officers.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Excellent. Thank you very much. Since you raised the thing about yourself and the Deputy, I noticed in the letter that went to Victoria Borwick it said, "The Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner's gifts and hospitality register is inspected by the MPA on a quarterly basis and signed off". I looked at the report to see if I could see how this worked and I could only find a paragraph by an MPA officer which said, "The systems in place for recording gifts and hospitality are operating effectively and, for the most part, adhere to the gifts and hospitality policy. A letter has been written to the Commissioner in respect of the two entries".

I am not going to ask you what were the two entries because I am sure you have not got the details at the tip of your tongue but that does not seem to me to be a proper system for monitoring and scrutinises gifts and hospitality; that an officer of the MPA has a look at the register and then produces a paragraph. Could I ask you if you could come back to me on that?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I can, but I guess your question is really for the Authority. I make my hospitality available --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** It is not an officer of the MPA; it does go to a Committee.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, it does but there is no information to the Committee. There is absolutely no information at all other than to say that the officer has looked at it and, in this particular one which is the last one, “The systems in place for recording gifts and hospitality are operating effectively and, for the most part, adhere to the gifts and hospitality policy”. Can I address it to you, Chairman?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Perhaps, Chairman, I could help on that because I think that I am the officer in question. Clearly, if Members had wanted further information that would have been available. If I could check out what has been happening and come back to you, and circulate that information to all Members when I do so?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes. Fine. Thank you.

**Toby Harris (AM):** I do not think it routinely comes to a Committee. It could do but I do not think it does.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** It does. I am struggling to remember which Committee and I would hate to have to admit that in public.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** It goes to something called the Human Resources and Remuneration Sub-Committee but the last report was covering the period October 2009 to May 2010 and certainly there was absolutely no information in that that would justify the comment the MPA see it and sign it off. I am happy for you to come back.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** I would like to do that if I may.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** The last question on this section. The Commissioner also said that the Director of Human Resources (HR) normally scrutinises the register for all ACPO officers. My concern is, because the Director of HR has been ill, this has not been done for a while I understand and I wondered why it was not possible for somebody else to do this?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will come back to you.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Fine. Thank you. That is question one.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Joanne [McCartney], you had a similar question on hospitality?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** My question was in regards to the redactions. I am very pleased that you are going to take out the redactions because, by using redactions, you are not giving full disclosure. I am happy that that is now taking place.

I do have some other questions on this. This arose because we all got a letter from Tom Watson Member of Parliament [MP] who sits on the Select Committee at the House of Commons and had been trying to get to the bottom of AC Yates' meetings with News of the World and, in particular, a Deputy Editor that he knows personally.

Sir Paul [Stephenson], AC Yates has disclosed that he has a personal relationship with this individual. In general, would you expect officers to get authority before meeting organisations or people that are subject to criminal investigations or may potentially be questioned in line of that investigation?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Joanne [McCartney], we need to be very, very careful here because, whilst we are not naming anybody, people can identify who we are talking about here. We are not saying that that individual is subject to any criminal investigation or, indeed, any potential. That is a matter for the current investigation. If I am trying to predict who might in the future be questioned for a criminal events that would be very difficult I think. I expect senior officers to use the best wisdom and judgement that we can and then be able to justify, transparently, what we have done. That is my expectation.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Would you expect officers to get authority before meeting organisations or individuals?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Not at this level, no. What we are talking about here are some of the most senior chief constable grades in the land and I expect judgement to be exercised by all ACPO officers. In the way that you are asking I would not expect any authority to be sought or needed.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** OK. The other question I wanted to ask - this has been asked by the Select Committee and the Culture, Media and Sport Committee - about a particular meeting earlier this year, in February, and it was alluded to in Tom Watson's letter as well. I know that AC Yates states that this was a private meeting and did not fall within the normal policy. Given that this has engendered such concern - and I understand the Select Committee is going to return to it - would you advise AC Yates to make full disclosure of that meeting?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Extraordinarily difficult. If I might be a little precise, because I think it is important, I do not think he says he went to a private meeting; I think it says in Tim's [Godwin] letter he went to a private social engagement. I think there is a very clear difference there. Again, it is very difficult. I go - you go - to many private social engagements at which there are friends, acquaintances and people I have never met before. To then try to declare everybody at a social engagement would be extraordinarily difficult. I am not going further because I am not trying to comment on John Yates' private life here, but he says - and Tim has done the due diligence on this - it was a social engagement and not a meeting. I think the letter makes that clear.

One of the thing, if I might, Chairman --

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Can I check that you have done some due diligence on that particular issue?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** For Tim to write the letter he will have asked the questions.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Thank you.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Is that fair?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** That is fair. Certainly we have answered the questions raised.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Joanne, could I add one other thing? In your original question you were quite right. I think we have addressed it by saying there will be no redactions. Of course there was no attempt to cover up in the first place; we were following ACPO guidelines in it and the information you are referring to was sent across to the MPA in relation to the matter you are asking without redactions. It was just on the website we were putting redactions in. I think that is the issue.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Right. OK.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thank you. Dee [Doocey], your second question, you said you wanted to have a written answer --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Happy to have a written response to my second question.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Your third question?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** My third question is how many investigations are ongoing across the MPS into human trafficking and, of those, how many involved the trafficking of children? You will know that, of all the things I have ever dealt with on the MPS, this is the area that I feel most strongly about.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** To my knowledge you feel strongly about a number of issues but it is a very high priority.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** This is definitely the number one.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We do remain committed to providing a high quality response to all allegations of human trafficking. It is a significant issue. We now have more staff dealing with it than ever before; I have asked for the numbers and I am told 37 dedicated. This has already started to produce positive results with more arrests, charges and convictions year on year. I would not paint the picture that we can

ever say this is perfection and it is an end game. We know there is a very significant issue here.

The team reviews all cases of trafficking recorded anywhere in the MPS to ensure opportunities for investigation are not missed. At this time we are currently investigating 46 allegations of trafficking, of which eight relate specifically to children. Our focus is to put their needs first. A dedicated team which works hard to support victims and communities, but it is a significant task.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Of the 37 dedicated staff in human trafficking how many are involved in the trafficking of children, ie the Paladin team?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will just see if I have got that. Operation Paladin. Dedicated team. SCD5. I do not have the numbers in Paladin but I am happy to supply them to you.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Can you come back to me? Are you aware of any under reporting to the MPS of child trafficking cases by local authorities and do you believe that every instance of child trafficking should be investigated by the MPS?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Am I aware of any under reporting?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Under reporting, yes.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** It is difficult for me to be aware of under reporting. I am not trying to be smart about it; it is very difficult. Do I think there will be more cases of child trafficking than come to my attention? Of course there will. I do not know about local authorities. I really am not aware of them.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Let me ask you a very specific question then. If you had, say, 50 questions raised by local authorities on child trafficking, would the MPS look into all 50 or would there be some sort of system whereby some of them were looked into and others were not?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am assuming here, if there were any allegations of child trafficking, we would automatically assess it to see if we can investigate it and we would investigate it to the best of our ability.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** OK. Finally on this, what input has the MPS had into the Government's Human Trafficking Strategy which was due to be published in spring this year?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I might have to come back to you on that as to what input we have had. I am quite sure we will have had an input because we are one of the centres that deals with this in the country.



**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I do not know, Dee, whether you have been to visit the Human Trafficking Unit at Charing Cross Police Station? It might be worth a visit to see. I happen, Sir Paul, to have been there a couple of months ago and saw the process around which reports come in and are then assessed and handed out to the various teams that will look at them. It is the case that every single one, as far as I understood, that comes through to the MPS is looked at.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I am looking in particular at child trafficking. I have been on a number of occasions to the Paladin team and I work very closely with them. I am also working with the Expat in the Lords as well. It is not human trafficking as such; the area of human trafficking I am concentrating on is child trafficking.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thank you for that. Caroline [Pidgeon]?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** My first question is there are 121 registered sex offenders that have gone missing from the London area. Can you please give a breakdown of the offences for which these people were convicted and what actions is the MPS taking to locate these offenders?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thanks, Caroline. As of 5 May 2011 the number of registered sex offenders managed by the MPS was 4,665. This is a rise of approximately 25% since September 2009. Of these registered sex offenders 118 are currently missing. That number changes but that sort of order is more or less the order of missing we deal with. It has remained more or less static despite the increase in numbers of registered sex offenders. There is a reason why there is an increase in the number of registered sex offenders; because people are now put on the register for a wider range.

A breakdown of the qualifying convictions is, of those 118, sexual and/or indecent assault on persons under 16 years; 26. Sexual and/or indecent assault on persons over 16; ten. This is as of that date. It will change. Sexual assault that does not go to penetration; 29. Rape; 30. Exposure; 13. Possessions of indecent photos; 4. Six further offence types including voyeurism, unlawful sexual intercourse, inciting prostitution, possession of indecent photographs and outrage and public decency. That is the breakdown. They are the sorts of numbers we are talking about. The number will fluctuate on a daily basis.

As soon as it is established that an offender is missing details are circulated to police forces UK-wide and to the UK Border Agency, and lines of inquiry identified to trace them. All actions must be reviewed by Detective Inspector within 24 hours, within seven days by a Detective Chief Inspector and every 28 days by a Superintendent. This is to ensure lines of inquiry are being progressed and sufficient resource allocated.

Registered sex offenders MPS-wise are also monitored and dip samples sent centrally by Operation Jigsaw to ensure consistency and provide advice. Intelligence indicates that, at this moment in time, some 45 of that 118 offenders may be living outside the United Kingdom. In these circumstances we have a process of liaising with the relevant national force to share intelligence and consider extraction. It is the case that not all countries

have similar procedures or, indeed, a sex offender register so, where people go missing internationally, we are dealing with different legislation and different rules and regulations.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** You say 45 you now think are living outside the UK. There are some very, very serious crimes that you have listed, many of them of child abuse. Have we got enough resources to deal with this area and what are you doing internationally, particularly if we have got people going overseas who may commit further terrible crimes? What are you doing to work internationally on this as well?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Do I have enough resources? I will gratefully receive any more resources that the Authority and anybody else, genuinely, can get for us. That is one of the issues of making very balanced decisions on a resourcing model to do the balanced policing model that I keep talking about. I passionately value uniformed cops on the beat but we have also got to remember we need specialist resources that we need to invest in.

One of the problems we have got is most countries do not have a register for sex offenders. What we are talking about here is missing. Off the register. People who are registered sex offenders. What we will be doing with is, whilst that is an offence here, in most countries they would not understand what it is we are talking about. They are missing from our register. They have already been dealt with for their crimes. There is an issue of these sorts of people being out and about but our job is to make sure we tell the UK Border Agencies and, where we can - and there is an active line of inquiry for an offence - we will follow it up. Of course, there are difficulties when we are talking about different standards and different legislation.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Coincidentally there is a report out today from the NSPCC which says that there is a child sex crime that is committed every 20 minutes, effectively in the country. It is quite shocking figures they have provided but the ones you have given us, the most up to date, show an increase from even the data it had. Will you be asking for more resources for this area in the next budget round?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Asking whom?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Asking the Police Authority to prioritise this area and asking the Government for more money in this particular area?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** You decide my budget and we have a discussion of how I disperse that budget. Operationally, it is for me to decide how I then staff the various elements that we have with the pressures on us. If I get more resources then I have got a broader decision to be able to make and a better decision to be able to make about how I staff various parts of the MPS from various specialist teams right the way through to boroughs. I would always look for more resources but, to be honest, I do not expect you or the Government to be giving me any. Not in the current financial situation. I have got to be realistic about it haven't I?

There is an issue here that, where we locate an offender abroad, we will work with CPS on the most appropriate extradition process but then we have got to accept other countries do not have a registration process, which is one of our problems.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** To get the scale of the thing, of the 4,500 there are 60 in the UK. That means 98.7% of registered sex offenders are known and, effectively, under control, which is a pretty good performance given the often chaotic lives that some of these people will lead and the fact that they are not in prison but are out and about and freely able to move. The performance is reasonably good.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Can I qualify something here before we get screaming headlines everywhere about this? Sex offenders are a huge problem for us. The number of missing off the register has stayed more or less static, despite that 25% rise. The rise in the number of registered sex offenders is to be expected, due to legislation commencing in 1997 and the threshold for adult offenders dropped significantly after the Sexual Offences Act 2003 which reduced the sentencing threshold for registration. In other words, more offences and more sentences are registered. This is a significant number there but you would expect there to be a rise in registration because of the change in our approach and legislation. Tim [Godwin]?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** Chairman, can I add one thing? The number remains sort of static but the people in it are different. We are arresting them. We are dealing with them for the offences but then someone else will go missing and we will go and find them. Apart from the 45 that are abroad and tricky most of them we do turn over so that is why it goes up and down and the offences will change. Others will go missing and we go and find them and arrest them.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** The figures I gave you in the offence types are as of the date I gave you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I was amazed that the number that are missing is so small out of 4,500 given the fact that they can just disappear off for a couple of weeks on holiday. Clive [Lawton], you wanted to ask about this?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, I fully want to endorse the sense that this is a very small number that we are talking about, taken overall, but from Sir Paul's [Stephenson] own information it does range across the full range of sex crimes to the most extreme. I am interested in the 60 or so who remain in the country. From what Tim [Godwin] suggested much of these 60 roll over - and also Sir Paul indicated that it is not the same 100 people missing all the time. I want to try to get a real sense of the problem that these 60 represent, as it were. Do they mostly disappear for a few weeks and then get picked up again or is there a hard core that go and you never find them or it takes forever to find them or they only turn up when they do something else and then suddenly they are arrested somewhere else? When these people go missing off the register how quickly is this triggered or notified or broadcast to other police forces around the country to look

out for this chap and known associates in other places? Is there an expectation, given that the number is not great, that people are going to slip away for a while, we are not necessarily going to activate this for whatever the protocols are - a few weeks, a few months, whatever it may be?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Firstly it is difficult, if not impossible, to answer the first part of your question. Without being flippant all of the above. The nature of people who go missing will range right the way across from people who are missing for a short period to people who want to go missing forever. That will change. The nature of these people will change. It would be wrong of me to give you some kind of statistical breakdown --

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Do you automatically trigger something? As soon as you find that somebody is missing from the --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Yes.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** What happens then?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I have already said that. As soon as we establish an offender is missing the details are circulated to police forces UK-wide and the UK Border Agency. To get some sort of context around this, the people that are missing abroad are often foreign nationals. When they are foreign nationals, missing abroad, in a country of their own origin that does not have a registration system, it is an entirely different process than we would be in were they living here in the United Kingdom. We take it very seriously.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Valerie [Brasse]?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Following that, the issue for me is not so much the number; it is the risk they pose. Presumably what you are looking at are those who are on that register who pose the greatest risk, because not all of them do pose the same risk. I wanted to ask you what the issue is about assessing risk and do you, therefore, prioritise your resources around those? I assume the answer is yes. I would like to hear that confirmed.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Firstly, do not forget we have the MAPA(?) process in place that manages people. That is very much risk based. You are absolutely right; the purpose of having a very detailed system of Detective Inspector reviewing within 24 hours, seven days to the DCI and the Superintendent is not just to go through the process but to review and make assessments.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** It is the prioritisation of resources where the risk is greatest. That is, presumably, the key.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** Absolutely. High risk / big man hunt.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Caroline [Pidgeon], your second question?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Yes. How many officers in the response team pilots in Lambeth and Brent have been redeployed in total and how many of the total are now working with Safer Neighbourhood Teams?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** My information here is the response pilots involved the realignment of a total of 255 officers from PC to inspector. They remain on Lambeth and Brent Operational Command Unit (OCU) and have not been redeployed elsewhere. That is the first part.

Secondly, the officers have been deployed in a number of ways. They are not just working with Safer Neighbourhood Teams but they have also been used, for example, to staff permanent custody teams and testing other aspects of the developing policing model. In Lambeth 78 PCs, I am told, are now working alongside their Safer Neighbourhood Teams in local policing teams. These officers are led by the relevant Safer Neighbourhood Team Sergeant. In Brent 12 Sergeants and 62 PCs are currently working as part of two local policing teams. These teams have a number of responsibilities but are also designed to operate in support of Safer Neighbourhood Teams to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour. The pilots are testing new ways of managing emergency and non-emergency response and there will be a comprehensive evaluation. That is the disbursement of those numbers at this moment in time.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** That is very interesting. I had, as I am sure you will be aware, tabled a detailed question asking for figures to the Mayor, trying to get some breakdown of this before today but, of course, the answer did not provide one figure at all. Your figures that you have given me, if I have added up what you are saying, in Brent you are saying 88 of the team are working with Safer Neighbourhood Teams? Is that what you are saying?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** In Lambeth 78 and in Brent 12 Sergeants and 62 PCs.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** That differs from the release of Project Erin in Brent which stated - this is off the MPS' website - that 97 officers were being released and, out of those 97, only 70 would be working with the local police team so 27 were going to be doing detention and front counter duties. My whole understanding of these pilots in Lambeth - as I used to be the Link Member - have been fairly involved in understanding it. The idea was you were going to put all these officers out to response teams and out to work with Safer Neighbourhood Teams in the front line, not to be doing detention or front counter duties and so on. I am concerned that, instead of all of these officers going out to front line, many of them are covering things which are far more behind the scenes, rather than supporting our Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** They are actually doing essential jobs. We have got to remember that. The purpose of what Ian McPherson is looking at is to see, "Can we do response better and can we do it cheaper with less people?" Then the people released, "Can they assist us, if we ever have to, in meeting cuts? but at the moment, "Can they assist us in operating the policing model in Brent and Lambeth?" That is what they are doing. They are being deployed to real jobs.

I actually think it is a bit of a success story that we have released additional officers to assist Safer Neighbourhood Teams but the idea that there would be an exact match between what is released there to what goes to assist on local policing teams I do not think that was ever the intention.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** That was certainly the impression that was given, that they would be out working directly with Safer Neighbourhood Teams more front line police officers and that certainly was --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** A lot of them are.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I appreciate lots of them are but not all of them --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** 74 of them are.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** 70 out of 97 is what we have been told from the MPS' website. It concerns me that the community who are supporting these pilots also have been told that all of these officers will be going to the front line and I think we need to be very careful in the language you use if a number of them - say 27 according to your website in Brent alone - are not doing front line services with the Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Caroline, I know it has been some time since I have been here but I am very careful with my language and I seem to recall, maybe about 12 months ago, I said to this Authority exactly that. I think we need to be very careful with our language and that is why I will not use front line, front office, middle office or back office any more. It is about operational capability. Phrases such as front line are designed to mislead.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** OK. It had been made very clear, certainly in Lambeth, that they would be working with Safer Neighbourhood Teams - which I would call front line - and it is clearly not the case from your figures today.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** The vast majority are.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Presumably you welcome the majority of the police officers who are working on the Safer Neighbourhood Teams?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I welcome the idea of trying to use resources more smartly. I am just concerned that we thought that more people would be out with Safer Neighbourhood Teams than are in practice.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Right. Graham [Speed]?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Chairman, can I come back on that particular point? I shared Caroline's confusion as to where people were going in terms of the Lambeth experiment and what it was actually going to look like on the ground. Although we had a number of briefings to that effect I could still not really understand what impact it was going to have on response teams versus Safer Neighbourhood Teams. As a result of that I took the opportunity to visit Lambeth at the weekend and to have the opportunity to talk to officers and supervising officers as to how this was working and where people actually went. Unless you can actually see this looking at a map and a plan saying, "This is the local policing team, this is the Safer Neighbourhood Team, this is where they are going and this is the control and supervision structure that works with that" it is very difficult to understand.

The point I would make, Chairman, is that I would urge colleagues to take the opportunity to look at these pilots and, potentially, to go and see them because, otherwise, an hour's lunchtime briefing does not really do justice to the concept. It is still work in practice and there are still areas that need to be fine tuned but there is clearly a great deal of promise with this as a way of amending or adapting the conventional response team model.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I think you are absolutely right, Graham; it is about trying to do it better but it is then about releasing resource. There is then a decision of what you do with that resource. The decision goes between how do you reallocate the resource for your balanced policing model and, in years in the future, how successful is this Authority going to be in attracting additional income and how successful are we going to be in cutting costs to make sure we can redeploy and not reduce?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** May I bring in my question on Lambeth as well? On the front counter vacancies?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** You can do I suppose, yes.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Or I will leave it until later if you prefer.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Just before that, as Link Member for Brent can I say that, in Brent, I think the initiative has been very warmly received and the flexibility available within to utilise these officers effectively has been very well handled by the borough commander there. It seems to me that, given we are at the very least discussing - whatever the final

outcomes will be - the business of flexing and not feeling too rigidly bound by Safer Neighbourhood arrangements so that we can use them well and effectively it seems particularly odd that new resources are necessarily ring fenced when they might locally be used in a variety of ways. Certainly from Brent - I say nothing about Lambeth - I think it has been a very effective and welcome development. It would be a shame to have it articulated in any other way.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I have had two people come up to me and say, “What have you done in Lambeth? There are cops everywhere”. I think it has been generally welcomed there too. Certainly when I met the Chair of the consultative group they were very enthusiastic about what has happened in the borough. Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Can I just note you called me to speak twice and I got interrupted twice so perhaps I could come in this time.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I did note that.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** My question was on Lambeth police. Lambeth police are intending to fill five front counter positions with police officers, rather than deploying Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). Do you think this represents good value for money and have you provided any guidance to borough forces on redeployment to fill front counter vacancies?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am going to ask Tim [Godwin] to answer this and say, “What have been doing in my absence?!”

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** Nice to see you back boss! The answer to that is, no, we do not want fully fit police officers to be doing front counter duties but we have always had to prop up front counter staff with police officers where there have been vacancies or whether there have been absences or abstractions. It is no different now to what it was before.

In terms of the current scenario in light of our fiscal position and the planning that we are having to do, there is a full review going on about how do you access the police, what should our front counters be doing in order to provide a service to the public, what hours should be open and what staffing levels do we, therefore, need as a result of that? That is going to come to the Management Board which will be discussed with this Authority. My expectation is that we will be seeking to reduce the hours that they are open based on the current demands of those particular front counters, but that work is still to be done and we need to evidence that.

A lot of the police officers that do get deployed into those sorts of roles are those on restricted and recuperative duties who cannot go out on patrol and, as a result, they provide a useful service through that medium. I know that Lambeth has been covering some of the abstractions there at this moment in time but that will be part of the Management Board debate.



**Jenny Jones (AM):** I only used Lambeth as an example; it is happening in quite a lot of boroughs. My concern is that you are actually now starting a reverse civilianisation. You are sacking staff of various kinds - PCSOs and traffic wardens - and you are then backfilling with police officers. This was all to cut costs and rationalise and so on. At the same time you have reopened recruitment for police officers. It seems to me that this is not good value for money. You are losing civilian expertise, backfilling with police officers - all right they might not be on full duties - but, to me, that seems like very bad value for money. You are boosting police numbers at the expense of value for money.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** One of the key points, as the Commissioner was mentioning before, is our ability to put 4,000 police officers out into Parliament Square sometimes quite quickly and the need for us to have that resilience in terms of police numbers, which is something that London has to have. Our strategic intention is to maintain police officer numbers as much as we can. It does not mean, though, that we are doing reverse civilianisation. What it will mean is can we afford to keep the station front counters open to the levels that we have with the number of people who use it at certain times? That is a debate that we are having. That is a debate we will bring in here.

When we are cutting the amount of money that we spend on policing there are certain things that have to change and this is one of those that I would suggest will have to change. We are waiting for that to be done. We have got a new emergency number that is going to be launched in June 2011 which will mean that it is easier to contact us via telephone. We are having more people using the internet and there are a whole range of alternative ways of contacting us which are far more effective and, at the same time, far more efficient. There is an issue that we need to do to encourage people to use it.

I am very aware that police stations are iconic buildings and they create the reassuring presence of the police. The bit that we need to do is to point out that the police officers do not go. When the front doors of the front counters are closed the police are still there. It is a thing that we are going to have to work with the Authority with through what will be a difficult process.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I would like to pick up on the Commissioner's point about all these officers you need for public order. Can I remind you you used 5,000 for the Royal Wedding so please do not constantly put it on to public order events? My point is not just about front office counters --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I think we used 5,000 police well on the Royal Wedding actually.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Sorry?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** That was a public order event.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** All right. Your suggestion was that it is demonstrations and things like that. Please do not.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** No, it wasn't.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** They are all public order.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Tim [Godwin], I understand this thing about police stations but, in fact, I am not just talking about police stations. I am talking about the fact that the MPS is going against all the advice which is that you put the police officers out on the streets and you get good civilian staff who can do all the filling in of forms and so on that you do not want the police officers to do. You are actually going against all that advice.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** I would say we aren't. What we are doing is we are reviewing how you access services and we are reviewing what we need to keep those front counters open. Do not forget, as we have mentioned here many times, we do have a large number of officers who, for temporary periods often, are on restricted and recuperative duties. They need to do jobs because they are still being paid and they want to provide a service to the public. That is where those officers can be deployed. Every time officers are deployed in that way - and I am not suggesting for one minute that there are not occasions when fully fit police officers are also deployed to cover because there are. What we need to look at is how we use those officers and how we make sure that we cut our cloth to what we can afford in our front counter accessibility to maximise the officers on the street.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I think you are boosting police numbers for May next year and you are not actually thinking about value for money. It is not just about **trying(?)** police officers is the problem.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** It is my strategic intent to maintain as many police officers as I can. I think it is right for London and I do think the MPS needs a surge capacity that no other force in this country needs because of the number of events we have to deal with. We do need fully warranted and fully fledged police officers to police London.

It is certainly the case that in some of the events we have had to police of late, to ensure we do not end up in the situation where I have to go out in front of the Yard and say, "We didn't get this right" we have used something like - I think I am right in saying, Tim [Godwin] - about 16% of the entire warranted police officer asset in the MPS on one event, and that includes 16%, and Tim and I are part of that 100%. That is on one day. We need police numbers in this city to police the events of this city and the requirements of this city.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** At the expense of police staff.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** You challenged us on value for money. Can I just say that something that we are eating, breathing, sleeping and dreaming about is how we get the best we can out of what we have. The planning processes that we are going to go through as we build the budget for next year will test all that so you will have plenty of opportunity to test our plans to see whether we are delivering value for money or not.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Just in the interests of accuracy, Jenny, you did say that people had been sacked and of course no one has been sacked. Any redundancies have been voluntary.

**Graham Speed (AM):** Chairman, on the issue of front counters, we have had a slightly wider ranging debate on it than I think we might have anticipated but it is very much a nettle that we have, collectively, to grasp around front counters and I am not convinced that we are doing that. It has a much wider impact on estates and other matters. It was certainly something that I picked up in terms of Lambeth and the concerns about the front counter and I am not sure police officers are on restricted duties. The problem, as I see it, is we are using expensive officers - they are more expensive than front counter officers - as they are not all on restricted duties, and that is having an impact on what we can deliver operationally. There is a collective frustration.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** If people could not interrupt. We have got an orderly number of questions. If people notify and put their hand up I will put them on a list and then they can make their comment but interruptions are now becoming a bit irritating. John [Biggs], you are next.

**John Biggs (AM):** The previous exchange fed neatly into my questions and questions one and three fit together as well, Chairman. Also, to clarify, I take responsibility for this but if you remove the word “channels” from my question it makes far more sense.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Would you mind reading the question out for the camera?

**John Biggs (AM):** I will read the question out. It would then read, “Review of public access. Can the Commissioner detail what the MPS has done to publicise its review of public access since it was launched on 11 April 2011? Will the Commissioner commit to publicise the raw response data as soon as the consultation closes so that MPA Members can see what Londoners think of the plans?” Do you want me to ask the third question as well?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes, please?

**John Biggs (AM):** Contacting the MPS survey 2011. Are you satisfied with the contacting the MPS survey 2011? Slightly different areas.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** OK, John [Biggs]. We launched a consultation back in April 2011 when the intention was to seek the views of the public

and partners on accessing police services, which is broader, as you recognised, than just front counters.

As part of that process we wrote to council Leaders, local authority Chief Executives, MPs, MPA Members, London Assembly Members and boroughs have been engaging with their strategic partners and local groups of people to encourage participation, including Safer Neighbourhood Ward Panels, Independent Advisory Groups (IAGs) and Neighbourhood Watch schemes. At a corporate level we have also engaged with The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Advisory Group (LGBT) and Disability and Race IAGs.

Another aspect has been the online survey hosted on the MPS website as well as the 32 borough websites. Boroughs have promoted the survey widely through local newspapers and emails to local businesses and residents. It has drawn significant comment from certain people in local boroughs - quite rightly.

All of our 630 Safer Neighbourhood Teams have been raising awareness through public meetings where paper copies of the survey have been made available. We do remain committed to providing public access to policing services. No point being here if the public cannot access us. We have just gone through a debate about some of the difficult decisions we are going to have as we bring this matter back and we debate it thoroughly. We do remain committed to a front counter style service as well as the other means. It is getting the right balance within what resources we have.

In relation to the second part of your question, John, the raw data, yes, we will publish the results as part of the paper and, if you really want the raw data, we will make it available to you. What we need to ensure is it is part and parcel of a much bigger and wider debate and it is the analysis of that data, but if you want the raw data then you can have it. I have got no problem with that.

Before I go on to the next point because you asked me, "Am I satisfied?", nothing can ever be perfect. There is obviously much more we could do. It is not my role to ask questions but if there is something else you think we should have been doing I am very happy to hear it.

**John Biggs (AM):** Shall I start with that then, Chairman? I think - and it is not just me that thinks this because I am pleased that I have helped to encourage my constituents and other people to respond to this and a number of them have come back to me and said they find it a very confusing questionnaire. It almost says, "This is what we are going to do and do you agree with it?" rather than seeking an active consultation. At the very least it is clumsily worded but it does give the impression, to my mind, that a hierarchical organisation is fairly clear what it wants to do and wants to do a bit of public relations (PR) around it.

If you take the example - of any one of the boroughs I represent and am a Link Member for - of Barking and Dagenham, there would be extraordinarily strong opinions in

Dagenham if you were to shut the counter there and say everyone has to go to Barking. Although physically it may be only two miles away it is 73 villages away or whatever the right language is. The same if you did it the other way round. There would be many examples around London. I know that there is a debate about resources and resources are scarce but this does seem almost like a consultation, the conclusions of which have been reached, and you are trying to dot the i's and t's.

If I take, for example, the first question, "Do you agree in our policy of a minimum of (inaudible) front counter per borough?" I am sure most people would agree with that although they might, if they thought about it a bit further, say they sort of agree with a minimum of two counters per borough, if it was Barking and Dagenham, for example. I am sure there are many other examples. I am not pleading especially for Barking and Dagenham. Tough choices. Need to have a proper debate about it. The consultation does not really facilitate that.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I take those points, John. There is no intention, on the back of this consultation, then to take decisions as to which front counter to close or not. This is about a broader thing of how do you want to access policing services in the future, recognising that demographics are changing and technology is changing. As Tim [Godwin] has said, we are seeing an increasing number of people report crime online, we are seeing reductions in use of front counter services and we have a wide disparity between different front counters. The busiest of our front counters deals with an average of 80 callers a day and the quietest averages about five callers a day. We are going to have to make difficult decisions.

We have not yet made the decision - because we are going to come back and have a discussion with you - to close any front counters. It is no secret we are going to have to make some very tough choices and we are going to have to make tough choices around can we afford to keep a front counter open when there are only five callers a day? We do want a front counter service so where is the best front counter service and how can we do it within constrained resources that are going to reduce over the next few years to make sure that we have the maximum number of police officers either in Operation Paladin or on the beat? They are going to be difficult choices for us and for this Authority. What we cannot do is close our eyes to the fact that London and our citizens are changing. They are changing their habits and the way they want to engage with us and we need to respond to that.

No decisions have been taken. I do accept there has been some misunderstanding. I regret that. Particularly around the idea of a minimum service in boroughs. We have done our best regarding the survey. I accept what you have said around it but this is about a wider issue of how do they want to access services. The actual really difficult bits about what does that mean locally is yet to come.

**John Biggs (AM):** I do not want to get into a detailed discussion about this. One thought that does cross my mind though is about the issue of co-location. It may be that, within the Authority, we can talk further about how we develop this policy.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Absolutely.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** There are a number of initiatives with local authorities in particular boroughs where there are quite advanced conversations about co-location.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We need some new thinking around this, John. It is going to be difficult but we do need some new thinking about it. Co-location. All the various things that we are now going to have to do --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** We have got a front counter in a Sainsburys somewhere. Up in Enfield I think.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** We have. The other thing that we have as well is, where there is a front counter service and it is not justifiable against cost, citizens have volunteered and kept one open as well. There is a whole range of different things that we can do.

**John Biggs (AM):** OK.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Jennette [Arnold], you wanted to come in on this did you?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** The answers to John's questions have (inaudible) --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Toby [Harris], you wanted to say something?

**Toby Harris (AM):** Yes. I made the mistake - trying to respond to the nice letter that I got telling me this was going on - to access the questionnaire and before I lost the will to live what you get are a series of questions talking about how you might access police services then, if you could not access these services over a front counter, it asked about every single service you might conceivably ask, which of the following would you prefer? It comes across as a rather leading question and I think that is why you are getting the assumption that this is about closing of front counters.

I recognise absolutely the dilemmas that you have got about all of this but I am not sure that these sorts of - I will not say it is a pseudo questionnaire because it was clearly very carefully designed and somebody put in an enormous amount of effort into it and it is also very long. It does hark back to the questionnaires I remember from 15 years ago when people were being asked of the nature of, "Which of the following crimes do you think are most important; murder, rape, burglary or anti-social behaviour"? It was not terribly helpful and I am not quite sure what tools it gives you.

Could we be clear? Have you thought through whether the investment in this particular type of public engagement is of sufficient value for the outcome that it gives you? People will say you have rigged the questionnaire, you have asked in a particular way or people will get bored before they finish answering so you do not get very much return. Is this

the most cost effective way of gauging this when I suspect, anyway around this table, we all know what the answers are going to have to be?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Toby [Harris], I take the points. I suppose it is right for me to defend the people who put this questionnaire together. I do not know who they are but they will be somewhere in Territorial Policing (TP) and they are working extraordinarily hard to try to find information. You know full well, whenever you try to do a survey to find more information around an emotive issue, it is very difficult not to set hares running.

The one commitment I can give you is this survey is not about which police stations are to close. We are being very honest about it. Tim [Godwin] and I would not sit here and say that we are not going to have to make some very difficult decisions altering the way in which we do public counters in London. I think it is absolutely inevitable. We need to come back and find out, based on whatever information we have got, the best attempt to get information, how can we do that in the best way that serves Londoners' needs? There will be different needs in different communities because people access services in a very different way. There are some communities do use the inquiry desk and there are some communities that do not. Treating it as one big community with one system is just not sensible in this day and age. It is wasting resource.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. I think we have talked about our misgivings about the consultation. Is your question about the same kind of thing?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** It is on the front counter. I am sitting here wondering whether I can make two and two add up to four but having heard the earlier debate about reverse civilisation it suddenly struck me that if you put expensive police officers into front counters will they then be used as the, "This is an expensive option and why we have to close them?"

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** The conspiracy theory of budget making is never that productive. Joanne [McCartney], did you have questions?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** I will be looking out for it though.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We will add it to our (inaudible).

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Exactly.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I understand from my borough commanders that you are going to be able to feed back on a borough by borough basis --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** -- and it would be useful if we could get that borough - particularly if we are Link Members anyway, that would be very useful.

My other concern. I understand the findings for this are going to feed into the local borough plans about which estates may have to be sold off or not. On the basis of this, if I take my own area of Haringey, for example, there are many communities that will not have taken part in this. I am glad you have recognised that you cannot just use an online survey to assess the needs of those communities.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** This is to inform the debate; not to make the decisions.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** OK.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** This is just a consultation - the first stage of a longer process which will require conversation with local authorities and others once it becomes clear what the direction may have to be.

OK. John [Biggs], your second question, which is similar to Jenny's [Jones] and Joanne's [McCartney].

**John Biggs (AM):** OK. It is entitled request from Government Ministers. How do you respond to requests from Government Ministers for matters to be investigated? This flows out of the particularly topical issue but I do not want to discuss that - maybe some of the other questioners do. I want to talk about the process and protocols.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** How do respond to requests from Ministers? It is difficult discussing it without discussing that particular case. I hear your invite. I would be a very odd Commissioner if I did not take very seriously a request from a Prime Minister or a Home Secretary. Just a matter of respect I would do. I have said that the decision was mine and it is an operational decision so whatever comes with that is my responsibility.

How do I do it? There is a further question that says what are the criteria considerations? I can go through what my considerations and my colleagues' considerations are. That is how we would consider such requests, no matter where they came from, but it would be very odd if I did not take very seriously a request from the Home Secretary or Prime Minister.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I think it would be useful to outline the criteria because that answers Joanne's [McCartney] question as well.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** These are the considerations. Do I have a process that is documented? No, it is about professional judgement at the end of the day.

The first thing that we would always consider is is it within our locus? Is it something that happens within London? If it is within London it is really straightforward. We own it and we have got a duty to get on with it. If it is not then there are a whole number of



considerations. They would include can we genuinely add value with our expertise and is that expertise something that the MPS uniquely or overwhelmingly has as opposed to another agency or another police force? Can we really add value?

We are talking here, in this particular case, about review expertise. This is a review, an investigative review, but that is what it is. It is what we actually do. In smaller forces they often ask for outside forces to come in and review their investigations. We are a region already. We do not need to do that. We have a permanent review capability. We have got expertise in it. We review our own across the MPS. We have that skill and that expertise.

Another consideration is is this a case where the international reputation of New Scotland Yard will be of assistance? It is the case, without sitting here being boastful about it, the reality is the MPS is the force that Governments have regularly turned to over many, many years to look for assistance, and it is the case that the New Scotland Yard reputation does assist in international investigations and international reviews because of that reputation. That is not denigrating other police forces; it is because they are accustomed to us, they are used to us, and we do have a certain reputation. So, will our international reputation assist?

Is there funding available if we do not have locus? I can say that we are much more rigorous now than we probably have been in the past in asking that question. I will come back to that. It is a very, very important consideration.

Do we have the capacity to do it? I have to then refer to this one in that consideration because it is one thing getting funding and then immediately what about opportunity costs? That is something we are not going to do here.

I have had some detailed discussions with Cressida Dick [Assistant Commissioner, Specialist Crime Directorate] and it goes back to the previous discussion that we are facing financially constrained times. We have been looking at, thankfully, a significant reduction in homicide over the years. I can tell you that, within the Serious Crime Directorate - we have not yet brought it to the Management Board for decisions - they are already looking at reducing the number of murder investigation teams (MIT) in there. As you would expect them to do to make their savings.

Having funding to do something with one of our MIT teams - I am not going to make any predictions of what the outcome is going to be and how long it is going to go on - may allow us to retain some additional people with expertise that we might not have retained had we just gone down the process of how many MIT teams do we need to deal with London's issues? I do think, with the MIT teams we have got - and we currently have 24 - we do currently have the capacity to do this and we will probably still be making alterations to the homicide command over the next nine months or so.

Critically, do we have the support of Government? That was absolutely essential in this case. In other words, is this something that not only would have Minister support but

does the Government support it and is there support from the foreign Government?  
There is no point in us doing something, or saying we can do something, unless we have that level of cooperation. That is critically important here. I do have to stress, in the case we are talking about, the lead for this investigation remains with the Portuguese authorities. What we are doing is a review.

On balance, I decided, taking account of all of that, it was right to take this on as a review. I have also got to say, John and Joanne, this is not unique. This is what the MPS has been doing since time immemorial. This is not criticism as much as transparency - before there was a Police Authority these things took place without any debate. Since there has been a Police Authority, some debate some times, but actually it is what we do. We review. We get involved in a lot of cases where we do not have locus. We always have.

We reviewed the Soham murders. Quite rightly we assisted. The advice and support, through the Antiguan authorities, over the investigation and murders of Ben and Catherine Mullany is a trial that is ongoing. We did not have locus but we offered our expertise. MPS officers supported the investigation into the death of Benazir Bhutto, you might recall. The review of the two Jersey missing people - Mark **Rennes** (?) and Laura **Farnworth**(?) - missing since the 1980s. We provided some assistance there and one of them was found. Conduct in a joint review. The Royal Bahamas Police Force around Paul Gallagher's death. The review of the Warwickshire fires. We did that. A review of the 2008 Jersey investigation into child abuse.

Every time we get a request we consider it. The one thing I can say is we are far more rigorous now than we have ever been in the past at saying, "Do we have locus?" Whilst this is not about (inaudible), there is an issue of, if we do not have locus, one of the very early considerations will be is there funding that will not take us away from essential work here in London?

Shall I continue with the totality of this answer? I know there has been some concern that this is about operational independence and it is being fundamentally breached. I know that is not you but there has been some concern expressed to me. That is a very fair comment. Actually nothing has changed. We have been doing this for some considerable time - since the MPS was invested I guess. It is an operational decision and it is not one we took lightly. I just need to stress that it is an investigative review and it is not the MPS investigating it. Probably more answer than you were asking for.

**John Biggs (AM):** I am very grateful for your answer which forms a very useful public record of what happens. You have mentioned the particular case - and I do not want to go into that - but it is a case which has pricked the national conscience in a whole number of ways and there will be a widespread satisfaction that maybe the MPS resources can help take it further forward.

My only hesitation is that there are, I am sure, many other people - hopefully not that many - in the UK who have felt similar pain from unresolved cases and who do not feel

that they are being offered these resources. That begs in one's mind a question about resources and prioritisation which we need to be transparent and clear about.

The underlying point of my question was about the protocol. Again, I have no problem whatsoever that the Prime Minister, with a high profile matter like this which has been referred to him - indeed it is a public expectation that he should express a view on it. You are sort of saying that it has happened since time immemorial and it is one of those things which people would describe as being the usual channels. If something happens there is a channel between - I would expect the Prime Minister to be able to pick up the phone and speak to you. I would be disappointed if a relationship existed where he could not do that. Indeed, one or other of the positions would not be tenable if that was the case, I am sure.

There needs to be, in this age of greater expectation of public disclosure, a protocol that clarifies how this happens, how you do review opportunity cost issues and the circumstances in which you can say no. Although there was a bit of post operation recovery the public perception was that the Prime Minister announced that this was going to be done and then you came in afterwards and said, "Oh yes, we're going to do it". I understand everything you have said but that does, in my mind, offend against the boundaries between politicians acting as politicians, politicians acting as leaders and you acting as an independent agency which acts without favour and preference.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I hear that. Do we need a protocol? This is about fine judgements and balanced judgements. We receive many requests and what I have gone through is how we would consider them. I hope my response has satisfied you that I would not actually surrender my impartiality - as you know, I jealously guard my operational independence, and I have on this occasion. I was very conscious of it.

It is not for me to answer how these things get announced by Government and I do not think you are asking me to do that, but I can absolutely assure you that in receiving this request and previous discussions - because other people have been involved at looking at this particular case, not least Jim Gamble from the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP). CEOP had already looked at it and made some recommendations. This has been a debate within law enforcement of how can various agencies assist?

In receiving this request and taking it seriously I did go through, with Cressida Dick, what is the right thing to do and what is our operational judgement? They are the considerations we went through in coming to that judgement.

**John Biggs (AM):** Finally then, the other purpose of having some sort of protocol or process is that it helps to protect you. Let's ignore the current personalities we have. Ed Miliband [Labour MP and Leader of the Opposition] is the Prime Minister. He phones you up. You say, "I've looked at it. It's not going to happen". He then picks up the phone to the Mayor, Ken Livingstone [Mayor of London 2000-2008] or whoever that is - Joanne McCartney - who says, "OK. I'll duff him up because I am now the

Commissioner for London's police". There are boundary issues there in which you need to be able to stand up for what is important and the right priorities for policing and the relationships work effectively and professionally. There is a vulnerability potentially there. We have seen recent incidences of lack of confidence and process helps to ensure that confidence does not, inadvertently, become undermined.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will take it away and consider it. One of the purposes of the Authority is to examine me and hold me to account and ask these questions so I can say publicly what I have gone through and the processes I have gone through.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Joanne [McCartney], can I assume your question has been answered?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** You have answered the democratic concerns I had in my question. Did you consider passing this back to Leicestershire Police because they were involved before? You could have given them a bit of expertise from the MPS and they would have perhaps undertaken it.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** My officers have spoken to Leicestershire Police and we have a very good cooperation there. I am not entirely sure how I would have done that. If you hear the considerations I have gone through it is about our expertise, it is about receiving money to make sure we do not denude London and it is about we do have the capacity and the capability because of looking to reduce the MIT teams. I am not entirely sure I would be very happy just sending that resource to Leicestershire Police.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** On the issue of funding you have been quoted as saying that there would be no limits on the review.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I was asked a question and I said there are no limits because we have not yet done the review and the scoping. It is not a question of this is open ended. I am very clear we are receiving additional funding to do this task. We have gone through a process. I think I published a letter that asked us would we and the financial conditions. That is what I am getting on with. This is not an open ended cheque and it is not going to go on forever. All I am saying, Jenny, is I cannot set a limit because we have not even done the scoping yet.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** No, I understand.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** The critical difference to remember is, as Sir Paul [Stephenson] says, it is my understanding, this is a review. This is not an

investigation. A review will come up with recommendations which then may be investigated by other parties. It is not an investigation which might just endlessly go looking. It is a periodic review which will come up with some recommendations.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** For the sake of clarity we call it an investigative review but we are reviewing existing documentation and data to see if there is anything additional that could be done or we could recommend could be done.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** You have got a certain amount of money from the Government - presumably it is not going to give you a blank cheque - and you will work within those limits?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We will get on with our job and make operational decisions. Then, with oversight from the Home Office, it will pay us quarterly in arrears.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Right. I am not really quite clear about this. You seem to be saying that no other victims of crime will suffer or have less attention because of tying up so many police officers. Is that really what you are saying? Justice for others will be exactly as it would have been if the MPS was not reviewing this case?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, we will carry on doing our job as we were doing. All I am saying is there is a process ongoing to look at reducing the number of homicide teams because of the reduction in homicide. That was already part of the SCD plan. It has got to talk to me about it. This might just give us the opportunity of retaining some additional skilled people but it depends on how long we are engaged in this process. That is simply it.

One thing I would say is, while it is very high profile and I understand the interest, there is no difference in what we are doing here as what we have done in some many other cases in the past.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I am glad you say that because you are also quoted as saying, "I'm a professional police officer. When you get a request to do something about a vulnerable missing child you should take the request very seriously." I have got a list here of missing children in London, some of whom have gone missing during your term of office. I am wondering if you will pick up these cases as well and review these cases? Would you do that? There is a little girl missing from Barking aged ten. She disappeared in 2009. Will you pick up some of these cases as well?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** If it is a crime that has happened we will already have picked it up.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I am talking about a review. You are reviewing the evidence. Why can't you review every single missing child case? If you are doing one why not do all the rest as well?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We do have a process but it is a process - and I do not want to apply it to any particular case because I am conscious, out there, there are distressed parents whose children are missing so I am not applying this to any case whatsoever. Where we suspect that murder could be involved with a missing child then we have a very rigorous process that, even where we have exhausted all the lines of inquiry, it will be reviewed every two years. If new lines of inquiry come along we will pick it up, if it is a case within our locus.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** We could argue about the locus. Ben Needham disappeared in 1991 in Kos. What about him? Are you going to review that case then?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** In actual fact we did give a limited amount of assistance to that case.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** What about reviewing it again? Has that been reviewed recently?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Jenny --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** You do take my point don't you? This has been --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** No, I don't take your point, Jenny.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** -- made a special case. I do not blame the McCanns. Parents will do anything - anything - to recover a child. Of course. Why is this a special case?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I have gone through the considerations.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I am asking you to review the case of Ben Needham. Will you review that case?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** If somebody asks me I will consider it.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I am asking you.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** No, I will consider it. We have already assisted, Jenny. I don't take your point. We do this all the time. We receive lots of requests. We go through considerations. Some we pick up. Some we do not.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Cindy [Butts] and then Kirsten [Hearn]?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Thank you for the Commissioner's response to John's [Biggs] question because that helped me to understand a bit more about the criteria. That said, I am still a little bit confused about the protocol and the way in which these cases come to light. Can you help me? In terms of the actual cases that you look at, how do you choose them? How do you make sure that you are assessing whether or not a case is worthy of

review? How do you do that? I am a little bit concerned it is a kind of he who asks gets. I am concerned about what then happens to those families who may not have the influence or the ability to try to influence politicians who might talk and speak up on their behalf. What happens to those families? That is my concern with all of this discussion.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** If it is outwith my remit, my locus, then it will be a request from somewhere else. I will not go in and consider should the MPS do something? It will be a request from somewhere else. Either from an individual or from Government or through the Foreign and Commonwealth Office or from a foreign country. That is the sort of thing that happens.

How do we do it? I have gone through the considerations that I would apply, or expect my officers to apply. That is how we do it. There are a number of different sorts of requests that come in to engage the MPS in cases where we do not have locus. Very often it comes through the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, "Would you assist?" It might come through other agencies. It might come from the military. We would consider can we add expertise, is that expertise unique or unusual that we have that other people do not have or does our international reputation add value? Very rigorously now, if it is not within our locus - it is not just about paying for us but we do want to ensure that there is the right amount of money coming in to ensure that London does not suffer. They are all the considerations.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** All of those criteria sound fine to me. They sound very good and very robust. It is how do the cases come to light? That is the bit that concerns me because, to me, there is an issue about whether or not that process itself is fair and which cases you then apply that criteria to. That is the bit that worries me.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** There is no one process. It could come from individuals - and we do get requests from individuals. It could come from a Government Minister. It could come from a Government department. It could come through other agencies. It could come internationally.

I do not go seeking these things. If I am requested for something that is outwith our locus we will consider it, from wherever it comes from.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Kirsten?

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Can I ask more strategic questions around this, if you don't mind? How many unsolved missing or believed abducted child cases have there been in the MPS's district in the last 30 years? How many of these are live, as in still open to investigation, and how many are closed? What criteria do you decide to use to close a missing case? Has there ever been an MPS-wide review of abducted or missing children, rather like the ones we have done with homicide reviews about particular communities where a range of cases are looked at from an organisational point of view?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thanks, Kirsten [Hearn]. Again, I am going to be very careful what I say here because I am conscious that there is a whole range of cases where children are missing and out there are a whole range of parents who are grieving, no matter what the reason is. Those cases range right the way from the most heinous of crimes to runaways and abducted by a parent. What I am going to say next I do not want to cause alarm and distress to parents.

We do have a process. When you say believe abducted it does depend on how you define abducted, Kirsten. What we are looking at there are stranger abductions and we have very few stranger abductions. Actually it is a very rare occurrence. I think I am right in saying - I checked this morning - we have had no, to my knowledge, stranger abduction investigations in London in the last ten years.

Now stranger abduction is very uncommon. The majority of child abductions are inter-familial and not committed by strangers. It does include a wide range of offences - it does not mean to say we will not do anything but we will proportionately respond - from a divorced parent taking a child abroad, maybe without the consent of a court, for a holiday, right the way through to the very rare but most heinous.

The term child applies to anyone under the age of 18 and circumstances surrounding the abduction of a 17 year old can be very different than circumstances around a much younger child.

How many of these are live is still open to investigation. SCD1, which is on the very serious end, are the people who would pick it up. They are not currently actively investigating any such offences.

Unsolved cases are not closed but they do get to a point, with any case, very few, if you exhaust all the lines of inquiry then it goes out of the active phase into an inactive phase, but it would be reopened if there were any new lines of inquiry. As I said previously, those cases are reviewed anyway on a two yearly basis. We will always pick them out in the more serious cases where murder is suspected.

All cases, murder and serious crime, are investigated by the Homicide and Serious Crime Command. We do go through a process for all such cases. Where a child is suspected to be or potentially a murdered child we do go through a formal case panel process when we have exhausted all lines of inquiry to consider should that now go into an inactive phase pending any further information coming in and then pending any outcomes from that two yearly review.

When you asked the question about the MPS-wide review I am assuming you are referring again to stranger abductions here, Kirsten. As I stated earlier, such cases are extremely rare. We do go through that review and we do also cooperate, nationally, with the Homicide Working Group so that we can assist each other. They are so rare that when something like this does happen in the United Kingdom forces do collaborate and cooperate together very heavily. You might remember the case of Shannon Matthews



which was at a national level and forces collaborated and cooperated because these are such rare cases and are so hideous and heinous.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK? Right. Thank you. Members, I am conscious it is 11.45am so if we could keep things snappy. Victoria [Borwick], you are next. Child arrests in London please.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. Again, welcome back - we have missed you. As I have asked three questions I will be very happy if we could just take one and the others could be written.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Fine.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Just to save time. I am mindful of the comments you have made.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thank you.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** While we are talking about distressing things, the number of child arrests and the sort of children who are arrested is a topic. I know I have to read the first line out because of the cameras. Child arrests in London. Recent figures show the number of child arrests in London were 46,067 last year. The figure is decreasing and we have the previous year's figures. Even so, to me, it seems a phenomenal number of people. I know there is good work going on with youth offending but I thought this is an opportunity perhaps for you to give us a little bit more depth about this difficult subject.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** OK. Thanks, Victoria [Borwick]. As a police officer I am not generally at all uncomfortable with the notion of cops arresting people for crime but, on this one, I want to celebrate the fact that we are arresting fewer young people. There is good news in there.

To broaden this out a little what we are looking to do - I am not wishing to patronise you here - is see an overall reduction in crime. Secondly, regarding children, we would like to see a reduction in youth crime - and we know we have had some problems around that but at the more serious end of late. Finally, I do want to see a reduction in the numbers of young people entering the Criminal Justice system and being arrested.

That is maybe good news, and there is a whole range of reasons why we are seeing a reduction. Firstly because crime has been reducing year on year now over the last ten years here in London. As we know, young people are significantly involved in volume crime. There is an issue around that; that crime has been reducing and that is why we are seeing the number of arrests reducing.

Some of the multi agency work that is being done is very good in different parts of London. There is Triage, the multi agency safeguarding youth (inaudible) disposals. Whilst there is no need for complacency, if we are going to persuade young people from

making the wrong choices in life, initiatives in general like the Mayor's Time for Action are helpful in galvanising and guiding activity to where we can make the best effect.

I will just turn to Triage as a good example of reducing young people's involvement in crime and reducing the need to arrest them. It was first introduced in January 2009 at pilot sites in Greenwich and Lewisham. They would argue - and it looks to me - that that has had quite a significant impact on reducing the need to arrest kids because they reduce reoffending. Within the last three months at Bexley Heath 68 young people on Triage have entered that programme and since that time only one young person has reoffended. That is real success.

There are a whole bunch of initiatives going on all over London, some of which are more successful than others, and that has been quoted as best practice nationally. Our job is to make sure we try to promote that best practice. That inter agency work that takes people out of the danger of being arrested is one of the reasons why we see less young people being arrested.

I do not think it is a reluctance of cops to arrest people because it is in their DNA to do that, where there are offences being committed. I also do think the general reduction in reported crime - and I understand there is always an under reporting of crime - is also part and parcel of the reasons of those reductions.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** I think all of us here would support any initiative to stop young people entering the Criminal Justice system. I know there are other initiatives that the Deputy Mayor has encouraged in order to stop people reoffending. It seems an awful lot of young people are out there who are coming into contact with the police and we should do what we can to try to minimise that.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Absolutely. Thanks for that. Valerie [Brasse], had a question on this too but you wanted a written response?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** I do. I am happy to have a written response to it. My particular interest was in looking at the under 14s that are being arrested and we have got figures of between 4,000 and 5,000. Again, the numbers are coming down. It is understanding that population and it is understanding the proportionality. What proportion go on to be then convicted and being very clear about break down by ethnicity and the types of crime and how that compares to the adults. If I can have that that would be great.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. We will do that in writing. You are next, Valerie, with questions.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** I am. My first question --

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** May the answers be circulated to all?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** We will make sure that happens.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** The first question is really a --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Sorry, Chris [Boothman], did you want something on that?

**Chris Boothman (AM):** Sorry. I raised some concerns about automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) as well. I wonder could they be addressed at the same time?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** On the written response?

**Chris Boothman (AM):** Yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. We will have a look at that too. Sorry, Valerie [Brasse], on your G20 question?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** It is a subsidiary really to the tragic case of Mr Ian Tomlinson. I want to pose this question though I understand now that the matter is under investigation by the IPCC and, therefore, any potential answer would be *sub judice*, but I would like to be able to --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** There might be some difficulties around answering the question. It might be more productive for you to meet privately just because of the --

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Right. I am content to do that. We have agreed that that will happen. Thank you very much.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** All right. Can we move on to your geo time mapping (inaudible) which (inaudible) will address --

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, before we do move on from that, can I commend the police witnesses? We hear an awful lot about police officers closing ranks between themselves and it is always difficult to come forward and say that you think something has gone wrong. I do not want to make any judgement on the nature of their testimony - that has got to be tested somewhere else - but I think for police officers to step up and say, "I'm unhappy about that" is really important that, in a public forum like this, we say that is commendable because there must be other pressures on them to not do that.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thank you. Valerie, your question on geo time, which Joanne [McCartney] has also asked?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Right. Can I put the question then? Geo time mapping software. It is understood that the MPS has purchased this mapping software which enables

comprehensive information about an individual's movements and communications to be aggregated. My concerns were around the governance arrangements which have been, or will be, put in place around the use of this software and, particularly, looking at security clearance levels for access and questions around authorisations, supervision and the like.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** My question was very similar. I can understand the instances where this could be useful, for example, following suspected terrorists or whatever, but there are obviously great concerns about the nature and scope of data that could be held. My question was also about the governance arrangements. I would also like to know about what evaluation trials you are doing at the moment and whether that is going to be referred back to this Authority at any stage?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will draw on my extensive experience and knowledge of technology and do my best to give you a coherent answer! So, I will probably stick to the script! Firstly, the software is currently not in operational use in the MPS but we are in the process of evaluating it and I am very happy to share that evaluation. At the moment we have purchased five licences following the expiry of the free trial so that we can evaluate this piece of kit.

The software, I am told, brings together existing information - it is not about new data and it is not about new collection - held by the MPS on the location and timing of past events into a single visual format to help build a clearer picture of what happened.

Currently this information is stored but analysed using different software applications. This is where I get a bit flaky! We are not using it to gather any new information at all; it is how we are manipulating that information to make the best use of what we already have.

If we make the decision to adopt the use of geo time following the evaluation we will adhere to a series of stringent processes and standards that govern the introduction of new technology specifically. In terms of security we would adhere to the Government's standards relating to the governance of computer systems - Risk Management and Accreditation Documentation Set (RMADS) for short. In terms of information full governance arrangements would be considered in consultation with the MPS Public Access Office. Geo time can be used to analyse existing information and all the information we gather is already gathered in line with the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information legislation.

In terms of how we would use the software, at this time we are still evaluating as to what its potential uses are. It does seem to me that the ability to better analyse what we have got and use that, probably post-events, to investigate crimes, if we can do that and do it more effectively, then there is good potential in this particular software. We have got to evaluate it first and make sure it is value for money.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** We are going to be sighted on that evaluation?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Absolutely. Happy to share it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thank you very much. Graham [Speed], emergency equipment?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Yes, thank you, Chairman. I will read the question. The question is, "In light of the issues raised by a recent IPPC investigation, could you please confirm whether you will review arrangements regarding the lack of routine provision of emergency entry equipment in police vehicles?"

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will try to be very brief in answer here. I do not think we can put it in a police vehicle. There is an issue of how many vehicles we have got and training people, then replacing the equipment when we need to replace the equipment. The key issue is we have got to make sure that it is available on every borough should the need arise. I have asked Ian McPherson to look again to see if he is satisfied with the arrangements for making that sort of equipment available. To put it in every operational vehicle would be unrealistic.

**Graham Speed (AM):** It would be helpful to have the results of that feedback, Chairman, on the basis that there seems to be a variance in terms of the provision from one borough to another. It would be helpful if there could be an operating procedure that says it is going to be provided here and officers know where it is provided.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. We will circulate a note. Your next question?

**Graham Speed (AM):** The second question is could you please confirm that there are sufficient ESDS, otherwise known as roadside breathalysers, and evidential cameras available to fully equip the patrol vehicle fleet? The origins of that are my concern is we seem to buy lots of these bits of expensive equipment but rarely do they seem to get out and about on the streets.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Yes. It is a similar answer actually. ESDS. There are sufficient available for patrolling officers to have 24/7 access but, again, it is not sensible to equip every vehicle. That is our view on it. We purchased a number back in 2009. They are allocated to Borough Operational Command Units (BOCUs), traffic OCUs and OCUs with uniformed patrol capability. Not all officers need it in their car at all times.

I understand, going further with your next question - do you want me to go onto that because there was another question about the Immediate Capture of Evidence from Front Line Officers (ICEFLO) --

**Graham Speed (AM):** That was the evidential camera. Same issue I think.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I understand with that that Croydon has said it has experienced some shortage problems with that and the ESDS. I am aware of that but it is about local arrangements; making sure that they make their own local arrangements to ensure the equipment they can afford is made available to local officers. I know in Croydon there are arrangements in hand to secure some additional equipment.

**Graham Speed (AM):** It wasn't actually related to Croydon as it happens. My concern, going back to the ESDS is, from observation and talking to officers, it seems the MPS purchases large numbers of these but there does not seem to be a consistent approach in terms of the supervision of the distribution of them. Frequently motorists are stopped and they do not have a breathalyser and they are sitting at the side of the road waiting for one to be brought from the police station or from the other end of the borough. That is clearly wasteful in terms of resources, it is not helpful in terms of the public and, potentially, people that have been drinking are getting away with it because we have not got sufficient numbers.

It is not a money issue. I think it is an organisation issue and a supervision issue in terms of making sure there are enough of these out there and I am not convinced that there are.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Just to give you the scale of the problem, if we took up everyone, 2,500 vehicles we would have to equip and approximately 20,000 drivers. That would not be a sensible use of asset. Similarly with the previous question I would ask Ian McPherson to satisfy himself that boroughs are doing what they should be doing to make it available to officers as they require it.

**Graham Speed (AM):** It would be helpful to have that feedback from Ian McPherson.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thanks. James Cleverly?

**James Cleverly (AM):** Thank you. Welcome back, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. This is my first opportunity to say that publicly. My question is on reducing bureaucracy. The Mayor and Home Secretary want to get rid of targets and red tape. Police officers on the ground say they want to get rid of targets and red tape. I have heard that local residents state they also want to get rid of targets and red tape. Indeed, both yourself and the Deputy Commissioner are on record as saying that you want to reduce targets and red tape. However, all the anecdotal evidence that I have received suggests there has been no substantive reduction in targets and red tape within the MPS so what is preventing this reduction?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** James [Cleverly], I seem to recall you have asked this question on a number of occasions. In my research it is 13 times either here or somewhere else and I have told my staff to stop preparing a new answer in the interests of saving bureaucracy!

It an important issue. The last time you asked this question I think I said this then as well. If you remember the then Chief of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

(HMIC), Ronnie Flanagan, made the point that bureaucracy in itself is not a pejorative term. Actually there is good bureaucracy and there is bad bureaucracy just like in cholesterol with good and bad cholesterol.

We have got to be really careful here because the one thing I am very clear about - of course I want to reduce targets etc. We have had that debate within the Police Authority and sometimes we agree and sometimes we disagree. Actually we will be, and we will continue to be, a performance driven organisation that will mean that I will insist - and I presume you will insist - on collecting data to ensure that we drive this organisation to improve all the time.

Now there will be officers out there who say, "We don't want to do this". I am sorry; they are going to do it. We have got to have performance information. We have got to do it as slickly as possible. We have got to stop doing what the MPS used to do which was produce different formats in different parts of the MPS so many times. That is where we need to go and we are trying to do that.

In terms of reducing bureaucracy we often concentrate on how many forms can we get rid of? I have to say, James, that is generally fairly meaningless because as soon as you get rid of a form any organisation somewhere will find another reason to invent another one. Forms aren't the real issue here; it is systems and processes.

The practical steps. I do not agree there has been no progress made because I pointed towards the introduction of integrated prosecution teams and Tim's [Godwin] leadership on virtual courts. That is about reducing real bureaucracy and streamlining systems. At strategic level maximising the way in which we do business. What we are doing in the Directorate of Information (DoI); using the lean process to reduce processes and make them leaner. That is about reducing bureaucracy. The stuff that TP is doing at this moment in time. Doing some reengineering in there. Building on some fantastic work that has been done over the years but then taking it forward to reduce things such as we were talking about in Lambeth and Brent about making better use in the way in which we deploy response officers and then reusing them in a better way. That is about reducing bureaucracy.

If we are just looking at how many forms we get rid of, frankly, I think that is genuinely a bit of a waste of time. If we look at what we have done regarding technical equipment, personal digital assistants (PDAs), we now have PDAs out there saving, I am told, around 11,700 hours per month by doing things more efficiently and effectively. That is about reducing bureaucracy. We have done a lot to reduce bureaucracy but where you and I would agree is it is not end game; there is a much more to do.

One of the concerns that both Tim [Godwin] and I have had for some time - but it is very difficult to address - is every time something goes wrong we invent another standard operation procedure (SOP). Every time there is a review of anything everybody wants another SOP. Generally all that does is remove the creativity of local officers to use their wisdom, training and values. We do need to have guidelines but we are guilty - as an

Authority and as a leadership of the MPS on occasions - of producing too many SOPs and too many guidelines. That is unnecessary bureaucracy. When we reduce them we have got to recognise there is a bit of a risk in there. It is getting that balance.

I agree with you we have got to do more, but I don't agree that we have not made any progress.

**James Cleverly (AM):** In which case I will concede a partial defeat on the practicalities. One of the things that does strike me, however - and I am conscious of the recent comments by Sir Denis O'Connor [Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary] in this area where he is saying he feels that nothing has changed and that bureaucracy is still embedded in the system. Whilst I do welcome those moves - and I am sure you are both aware that the volume of those SOPs is a particular bugbear of mine so any move in that direction I am very pleased to recognise - for whatever reason these improvements, where they exist, do not seem to be percolating down into public consciousness.

In the same way that we take seriously peoples' fear of crime because we understand that fear of crime is debilitating and, whilst it is not necessarily connected to actual levels of crime, has a very significant impact on population, in terms of confidence in the professionalism of the police force in its broadest sense - and not just professional conduct but the ability of the police to maximise what it does - that the view that there is still an excessive level of bureaucracy and of red tape is still a view which is deeply embedded in many areas of London including a lot of the --

**John Biggs (AM):** Is this a question, Chairman?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I assume the Member is coming to a question. I seem to remember your question was not a question either; it was a statement. James, carry on.

**James Cleverly (AM):** Including Safer Neighbourhood Panel levels. Here we come, John [Biggs]. Pin your ears back and get ready for this! What more can be done to ensure that the people whose confidence we need to maintain believe that these reductions in excessive bureaucracy are (inaudible)?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will ask Tim [Godwin] to come in but very quickly on what more can be done? What TP is doing. What DoI is doing. Re-engineering processes. What Tim has been doing leading on criminal justice. Can we do more? Of course we can. Do we always want to (inaudible)? Yes, we do. I welcome the opportunity, in our debate today, to say when we say there has been no progress made that is palpably not true because I can quote a full list of good progress. It is my opportunity in this debate to try to get the message out there. We are making progress but I do agree there is much more to do. Tim?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** Equally, there is a Ministerial group that is looking at - which is what was being alluded to by Sir Denis O'Connor with the Home Secretary which is related to the bureaucracy agenda which means changing things like



the National Crime Recording Standard we have mentioned here *ad infinitum*. They are now considering that but that is very politically challenging as to the impact that that will have and how that might be perceived. There are things about risk.

One of the things that we took great pride in was the reduction in domestic violence homicide by putting in our risk forms. Very unpopular with officers. Every time they go to one they have to fill out all these factors that go in to look at what those risks are. There is a suggestion we should stop doing that. I know that there are Committees here that will have a key concern. A bit like the stop and account. It is not as easy as just chucking away things. There is a whole group that is looking at that at Ministerial level.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes?

**Chris Boothman (AM):** A related one. It has already been partially mentioned. It is paragraphs 36 and 37 of the Commissioner's report about the PDAs. This seems, to me, to be a really important subject. What I want to know is what are we going to do to maximise the efficiencies that can be made with electronic devices? Allied to that question, is there any truth in the suggestion that officers are really reluctant to discard the notepad and pen in favour of the PDA device?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Briefly. Do not forget the PDAs apply to, I think at this moment in time, six applications. That is not the totality of what officers have to do. I am afraid the pen and paper is still part and parcel of all our lives and will be for a long time to come. The PDAs are reducing bureaucracy. They are saving a lot of time. It is how we roll that out. We have now got 3,300 devices out there. Doing six applications. Of course we want to spread it further but it has got to be robust and we have got to be able to afford it and be able to train people.

Inherent in your question is the issue of will there always be reluctance and resistance to change? You find anyone round this table who does not, on the one hand, say they are up for change and then is very reluctant to do it. It is part and parcel of our nature that we do not like that sort of change and that is part of what we are doing in lots of parts of the MPS, but we must do more.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Right. We are into the home straight now. Jenny [Jones], your question on Fortnum & Mason?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you. How many of the protestors arrested at Fortnum & Mason for aggravated trespass were given the bail condition of not being allowed in the area of Westminster and what was the justification for these conditions?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am saving my voice. Tim [Godwin] has said he will do this one.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** There were 145 individuals who were arrested on 26 March 2011 and 138 were charged with aggravated trespass in relation to Fortnum

& Mason. Three further arrests in relation to Fortnum & Mason have resulted in charges for theft, criminal damage and aggravated trespass. The next court date is 27 June 2011 at the City of Westminster's Magistrates' Court and we worked closely with the CPS in reaching the decision to charge and to continue to do so.

Out of the 148 arrested - that is the 145 plus the additional three - 67 were given bail conditions to prevent further disorder. That was based on an assessment that they were likely to return and to commit disorder. All have now had their bail conditions lifted either prior to or at their first appearance. A number of other bail conditions were imposed on those arrested and are charged with violence and damage after the disorder on 26 March 2011. Obviously the court will test whether it thinks those conditions are fair.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** What was the justification though for not being able to go into Westminster?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** That is an individual decision unique to the individual at that time that is made by the Custody Sergeant in order to prevent re-offending. You would have to go through each one. It was to prevent further disorder.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** On that day or for the Royal Wedding?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** It was to prevent further disorder going forward in terms of returning to and going back to Fortnum & Masons, for example. It would be an example but each one is unique and has to be tested in court.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Do you know how many charges have been dropped against the people who were arrested for aggravated trespass?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** I do not think I have got that data here.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Is it something you could let me know?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** I will.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** The other concern I had was about the pre-emptive arrests that - actually I am going off the point so I will not ask you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Right. Thanks. Joanne [McCartney] on year end crime statistics. That is really a question for us. Apologies. The answer is, yes, in future we will.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** The crime statistics had some percentages and some numbers and you could not make head nor tail out of it. When the figures came to SOP as well we made those same comments; that it was not a --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** If you drop us a note of exactly what you would like to see, in what format, then we will endeavour to fulfil that.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** It is another example of releases being made or reading things in the press and then MPA Members not being sighted on what is behind it in adequate time.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** It is a timing issue and we will seek to rectify it.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Last written question. Kirsten [Hearn] on hollow point ammunition.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** What was the criteria used to decide to purchase hollow point ammunition used by firearms officers in the MPS? Second question. Has anybody you know been killed by collateral damage caused by a bullet hitting a target and then passing through and then hitting somebody else near police? What public messages are being put into place to manage the message that the MPS is now deploying ammunition deemed not to be suitable for use in warfare?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you, Kirsten[Hearn]. In response to your first question we first looked at the operational requirement. We carried out extensive testing looking to engineer the best balance between limiting over penetration and incapacitating hostile subjects, because that is regrettably what we have to do on occasions, with minimal fragmentation - in other words the round staying whole and not fragmenting inside somebody's body. And, of course, increasing liability. All operational requirements.

The aim of that extensive testing regime was to identify the most appropriate ammunition for different calibre of weapons and also, taking the opportunity, the contract was coming to an end, how do we get value for money out of a re-contracting situation involving ammunition?

In answer to your second question, there have been no incidents reported following the use of firearms via the MPS where an individual has been injured or killed by a bullet hitting the target and then passing through or bouncing off the target. However, based on scientific evidence, we know there is a risk of that happening. That is simple. We have a legal and moral obligation, to our officers and the public, to ensure that we take account of that risk and to minimise it in those circumstances where it could happen. The fact that it has not happened does not mean to say we should not consider it and do something about it.

Although it has never happened in the MPS with a police officer shooting there have been cases where criminals have used firearms and injuries have been caused by over penetration and ricochet. In other words it can happen.

In any MPS firearms' operation the primary aim is the protection of life and public safety and we do believe the new ammunition offers the best risk of that in terms of managing that over penetration.

Lastly, your last question. We consulted the Armed Police Reference Group which is a multi agency forum with representation from interested parties ranging from faith groups and including disability forums.

In addition, a press briefing was given to the Crime Reporter's Association and the new contract was openly reported in the *Evening Standard*. I discussed it on the radio. I think it was last week I was asked a question in a drive time programme last week.

I have got to say, Kirsten, it is key to point out that the MPS is not deploying ammunition deemed unsuitable for use in warfare. A hollow point is not - as many call it - a dum dum bullet. There is a difference, and a big difference. A dum dum round is a name given to a jacketed round where soldiers used to file the top to expose the lead which flattened and fragmented on impact. That is what a dum dum bullet was. Thereby causing massive damage and having a lot of invading articles in the body. What we are doing is using ammunition that is lawful and that is more effective in terms of stopping - that is why we do discharge firearms - but also does not fragment when it is inside the body. We think, from a policing perspective, it is the right thing to do.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** OK. Thanks.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, following on from this, I was asked by members of my constituency who are very concerned because they have lived in communities where firearms have been discharged. Their concern is that this is the same sort of ammunition that was trialled in New York some years ago and that the New York police thought that it was less accurate and that it was more likely to produce more bystander victims with gruesome injuries. I said that I would - well you can shake your head, Chairman, but I have been asked to raise this and I would prefer it if the Commissioner could clarify this concern that I have picked up?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** No, I understand. I am saying it is just not the case.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** It is a reasonable concern because we are not all as knowledgeable and important as you are. Is this in any way a similar type of ammunition and what tests have you, as the MPS, carried out given that we have an environment, which you are aware of, that may well produce bystander casualties?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Jennette [Arnold], thanks for the question. If people are concerned I am very happy to go through the testing we have done and also to repeat why we have done this. It is a horrible phrase but the short

answer is to reduce collateral damage - to reduce other people being hit by bullets passing through bodies. It has been scientifically tested and proven that this ammunition is far more effective in achieving its purpose and less likely - less likely - to over penetrate so it is less likely to cause injury and risk to other innocent members of the public.

The testing we did. It covered an intensive 12 week period. Done under controlled scientific conditions with scientists assisting us. What did it involve? Extensive ballistic testing. Testing in ballistic gelatine and also through barriers such as double glazing, windscreen glass, simulated vehicle bodywork and heavy duty clothing material. Over 16 tonnes of ballistic gelatine was made, used and analysed as part of an exhaustive testing process. Scientifically tested to ensure that this thing does what it is supposed to do and that is to be more effective for the purpose it is used for and to reduce the risk of over penetration.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Is it possible for you to answer the question that was also raised; is it similar to the ammunition that was tested and rejected by the New York Police Force?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** It is not possible for me to answer that because I do not know what New York used, or Chicago, or lots of other police forces around the world.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** They were using nine millimetre semi automatic guns firing what I think you would call a dum dum bullet.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** No, this is not dum dum ammunition. We are specifically not using dum dum ammunition and we are not using ammunition that is not allowed to be used in warfare. This is entirely different. Dum dum bullets have the tops filed off and they fragment on impact. What we are using is the opposite. That is the important thing. I do not know what New York used and I would not know.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I think there was a note circulated to Members about this at the time the decision was taken. Cindy [Butts]?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** It is not on this point.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Isn't it? Does anybody else want to ask on this? No? OK. Cindy?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** I wanted to thank the MPS for all the work it has done in helping to secure the arrest and charge of two individuals for the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence. I think it is through your relentless seeking out of more evidence that has allowed that to happen and it is right that we acknowledge the work that you have been doing on that. It is early days of course but at least a hope of justice being delivered is a good thing.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thank you. Steve [O'Connell], finally?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Thank you very much. I wanted this opportunity, while the Commissioner is here, to echo the earlier comments about the Croydon officer, Nigel Albuery, and to echo the comments about his bravery and that we should never take for granted the day to day challenges and violence that our officers face. We should always remember that and I am very pleased that PC Albuery is back home recovering. I would like, just for the record, for this organisation to thank him and his colleagues for their bravery and to note that that is the sort of bravery that our officers have to exhibit every day out there on the streets. Thank you for your comments earlier, Commissioner.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Yes, Chris [Boothman]?

**Chris Boothman (AM):** One brief question, Chairman. Sir Paul [Stephenson], the *Sun* newspaper has recently published what appears to be an MPS video relating to a matter soon to be the subject of a disciplinary hearing which relates to a group of north London based police officers. Will you be investigating how this video got into the hands of the *Sun* newspaper?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We will be asking the question. It would be wrong of me to comment in detail about this. This is an ongoing disciplinary case, as you are aware, but we are concerned about the appearance of certain images. Let me simply say it could be there for a number of reasons from a number of sources, as you are aware. Yes, we will be looking at it. Is that fair to say, Tim [Godwin]?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner):** Absolutely.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thanks very much. Thank you for that. Thank you, Commissioner. We move on to item six. The Race and Faith Inquiry. We have got 6(a) and 6(b). Are Members happy for us to take the two sections together? OK. Catherine [Crawford]?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Chairman, Members are well aware that there has been a commitment to bring back on a regular basis progress against the recommendations made in the important Race and Faith Inquiry which was convened right at the beginning of the current Police Authority. The papers are separated out because it does seem to us that there are a whole set of largely internal recommendations addressed both to the Metropolitan Police Service and the MPA on which we need the regular updates, and that is paper 6(a). By and large I think that is a very promising and encouraging story about the progress that is being made and that continues to be made and continues to be properly overseen.

The significant recommendation of the prospect for multi point entry into the police service should be pursued is qualitatively different in the respect that it involves external partners. In order to change regulations there would have to be national changes. We did

not want to confuse the two issues by continuing to pursue them within the one framework.

The first paper 6(a) is, effectively, to note the progress that is being made. The second paper, 6(b) does suggest a number of follow up actions in respect of the multi point entry following the very successful event that was held at City Hall. We have written to the Home Secretary. We have yet to receive replies to that. There are a number of avenues to be pursued, including a proposal that we have a guinea pig trial of what sort of processes might be used if the regulations allowed us to move in that direction.

I am sure Cindy [Butts] will want to follow up on that introduction.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Cindy [Butts]?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Thanks, Chairman. There is not much more to say other than I think we are making some good steady progress. As with most reviews and scrutinies it is always the capturing of a moment in time isn't it? The approach I have tried to take in terms of implementing the recommendations is to say, "Yes, let's try to tick off the recommendations that we came up with but, equally, the world is moving on". In some senses the inquiry did not go far enough on. There are things that the MPS is doing in some instances that I think, "Oh that's going beyond our recommendations and therefore we really fully support it". I have tried to take a more flexible approach other than simply ticking off the recommendations.

Within all of that you will see some areas that the MPS is making really good progress on and there are some areas that we need to focus on, particularly around the issues to do with lateral development. I still do not think that is an area that is being properly considered. I still think that there are issues around the capacity of Diversity and Citizen Focus Directorate (DCFD). Trying to make that much more of an internal inspection model so that it is able to deliver not just to share good practice but also to home in on those areas within the organisation that still need further work. There are some really, really good areas that we ought to congratulate the MPS on on having delivered, but there are others that still need work.

I guess the bigger question for me is, as we come to the end of the Authority as we know it, how are we going to pick up the issues, particularly those issues that have been around for some time, and ensure that they remain on the agenda and they become legacy items that the new body will see as important ones to tackle.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thanks for that. Tony [Arbour]?

**Tony Arbour (AM):** It really is on 6(b) that I want to speak and I would like to think that we might be able to give a steer on the recommendations that there are in 6(b). I am particularly struck by paragraph 46 in the appendix which appears on page 78, "The police service has a long history of responding positively to challenges both in what it is expected to do and how it is expected to do it. Multi point entry should therefore be seen

as an opportunity to address the current challenges by enabling the very, very brightest and the very, very best from all walks of life to have a career in the police service". I think that that is something that we would have wished to do irrespective of the Faith Report. I am pleased that we are addressing it now but sorry it has come around in this way.

The option which is suggested in relation to rank skipping is the best one in so much as it ensures that every entrant continues to serve some time as a Constable. I have no doubt that it has always been the view of the public that everyone should serve some time on the beat.

I have read this report very carefully and I think that this enshrines what we all want. I, for one - I know that this is going to be considered further - would like to vote for rank skipping.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thank you. Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I have two comments if I may. One is on the new arrangements under the Mayor's Office of Police and Crime (MOPC). I noticed from the update on the Race and Faith Inquiry it states that, "The challenge is to ensure equalities are mainstream through the new MOPC operating model". It is fine to mainstream as long as you are satisfied that the initial work has been done. We have heard from Cindy [Butts] today that there are some recommendations that are going to be taken forward and some that are not.

I really want the assurance that there will be someone who will have the responsibility for ensuring that this work is carried through and that will be at a very high level in the new arrangements as well.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** That is in the proposed structure of the new organisation.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** The other issue was on 6(b). It was on the rank skipping as well but a slightly different view from Tony [Arbour]. I do not have any great concerns with it but having sat in on ACPO in particular appointments, it is quite clear sometimes that when applicants have been allowed to rank skip previously because they are seen as being very able, we have often looked at CVs and said, "There is a gap here and there is a gap missing". If we are looking at that I want to know that, as an organisation, the long term picture is looked at as well because we want our very brightest to go on to the very top and not to be prevented because they have been allowed to rank skip previously.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I am not sure it has necessarily been rank skipping but job skipping. We have often looked at candidates and said, "They haven't been a borough commander" or, "They've gone a particular route that way and therefore haven't got the experience". It is that kind of thing. Sir Paul [Stephenson]?



**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I entirely support the desire that, in the future, we do have the very brightest to get to the top and rectifying any decisions we have made in the past! A slightly sensitive response perhaps, John [Biggs]! Tim [Godwin] and I have been in the minority in the police service for some considerable time of being, hopefully, a little more creative about thinking about the issue of direct entry.

I do have to say, in saying that, I do think we ought to be considering it and that is what we have said to Tom Windsor in the next part of his review. I also think we have got to be very, very careful that, in doing that, neither are we naive. Anything that got my support would have to take account of what levels are we looking at, how do we manage to get the right level of experience and how do we ensure the people who are going to do the job are not going to be put in a position where they cannot possibly discharge some pretty heavy duty responsibilities.

I do not think it is straightforward. I think it is very difficult to do but I do think we ought to be looking at it more creatively.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Faith [Boardman], yes?

**Faith Boardman (AM):** I wanted to support the general approach in 6(b) but also to feed in personal experience from having been a fast streamer within a fairly similar - not identical - scheme within the senior civil service. A couple of points come out of that I think.

The paper recognises that there is a very big culture shift that has to be made and certainly from my experience of being in the early days of a similar system it is difficult for individuals to be accepted and there are additional challenges to them over and above the obvious ones which come from any grade skipping. They also need to get as big as breadth of opportunity as possible in their early years in order to make up in short time the range of experience that we do really expect the most senior people to have.

One of the solutions that I certainly found to be helpful is to have some sort of grade manager or fast stream manager - often with the Human Resources (HR) discipline but not necessarily so - who can provide them with personal mentoring and support but also can assist in ensuring that they get a wide range of developmental jobs. Jobs in which they need to be very much tested and I very much approve of the idea that if they do not come up to grade then they stop being on this scheme. Somebody who can hold the ring and ensure that they do get that breadth of experience but also provide them with independent mentoring from somebody who really understands what their peers are doing.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you. Interestingly you have got sat here two people who have experienced two parts of such a scheme. Tim [Godwin], in his days at the navy, was direct officer entry, when he sailed the seven seas and did whatever he did sailing the seven seas. I, when I joined the police service, was on a fast

track scheme, a special course. We have had this before. Sometimes we need to remember our history. I think it has produced some good results but we will leave it at that! A fast track scheme of exactly the sort you are talking about so you get to a certain rank very quickly, providing you could pass certain criteria.

We currently have a high potential development scheme. I do not think it is as rigorous as the old special course scheme actually. That was much more rigorous. Where I do agree - and this would take account of Tony's issue of rank skipping as opposed to direct entry - is I do believe in high potential development schemes. I think it is something we should be much more rigorous about. The one thing I am very clear about is all such schemes should be very, very difficult to get on and very easy to be kicked off. That is the most important thing about high potential development schemes. That is where most of them fall down but, once you are on them, it is almost impossible to be kicked off. That is where they fall down. That is where the police service ought to be looking again about high potential development.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thank you very much.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Chairman, can you say something about what happens with this? The general thrust is that you want to explore this whole debate further and, particularly given the current climate that we are in, it is important that we look at more creative ways. Given that promotion is going to be so difficult and given that we will be doing less recruitment I think it is important that we grasp the opportunity to do something really quite creative in terms of addressing the skills and all of those things of officers --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Absolutely.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** What are you proposing happens next with this?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** The recommendation in the report was that we should attempt to kick off some kind of national debate and that is what we have attempted to do. We have done that. It is quite a good question actually - what do we do next? - because a direct entry thing is going to require some legislative and regulatory change. We fed that into the Windsor review and Windsor may be the route.

His second report, which will look at some of this stuff, has been delayed until is it 2013?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** It is December 2011 isn't it?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** December 2011 or January 2012.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Quite sensibly actually.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** That gives us quite a lot of time now to get some of the feedback in and some of the views that we garnered in what we did. He apologises for not being able to come to your symposium, Cindy [Butts], but, nevertheless, they had

people there and I have got the notes and everything. As part of our submission generally - and I guess as part of your submission to Part 2 - we will be talking about some of these issues. Effectively, it will be for Windsor to reply.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Sorry, Chairman, just to understand, multi point entry is not open to us simply to introduce. What about rank skipping. Is that open to use to introduce if we so chose?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** It is open to me!

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Yes, I was using the royal plural on your behalf! What I mean simply is this is not something that requires legislative change, it is something we could agree in the MPS?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** As I was saying, Clive [Lawton], we do have a high potential development scheme. I happen to think that we need, nationally, to reignite the high potential development scheme and do more with it. We do have a scheme and some people go faster and some people go slower on that scheme. We do not, generally, do rank; it is about speed. It is not necessarily always about rank scheme.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Such amendments are available to us? What I am saying is that that is not bound by legislation or whatever it is --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** The decision on promotion rests with us. The decision on direct entry does not rest with us. I think that is about it.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Right.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** All right. Thanks very much for that. Item seven is the Committee structure. Agreed other than it does say that the recommendation is that the Chairs of Membership Committees and Sub-Committees and other appointments remain unchanged. If anybody is unhappy or wants to change between now and the Annual General Meeting (AGM) could they please let us know and we will try to sort it out before we get there?

**John Biggs (AM):** Formally, Chairman, you cannot really usurp the role of the AGM --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Exactly. That is why I am saying --

**John Biggs (AM):** I have no problem with the tenor of the --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** This is notification please than rather get to the AGM and have a squabble about who wants to be on what, if people could let us know if they are unhappy with what they are doing or they want to change and then we will attempt the annual game of 3D chess to move people around.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Can you just remind us of the date of the AGM?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** It is the last Thursday in June 2011. Graham [Speed]?

**Graham Speed (AM):** I do not have a problem with that, Chairman. I may have dozed off earlier on and I missed it but my understanding is we had the Commissioner's report and we had written questions to the Commissioner, but have we bypassed questions to the Commissioner on his report?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** We have. We had a couple of non-scripted questions that people put their hands up and said they wanted to ask and I asked them.

**Graham Speed (AM):** I see.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I asked them but you did not put your --

**Graham Speed (AM):** I did actually indicate and I thought you had acknowledged it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Right. OK. Apologies. I am sure the Commissioner would be happy to answer a question for you once the meeting is finished. OK. Thanks. Item seven is done. We can take it under any other business if it is really pressing?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Clearly not, Chairman! I will speak directly to the Commissioner and probably have a more productive discussion.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thanks very much. Reports from Committees. Chairs have anything to raise on reports from Committees? Victoria [Borwick]?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Just to say that we are hoping, with your approval, Chairman, to bring the next report of the Civil Liberties Panel on DNA to the next Committee. We felt that Race and Faith should take priority at this Committee and, therefore, I would crave your indulgence that we should bring the report to the next Committee.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Thanks. Any other business. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Just for information. The Olympic Sub-Committee is doing a complete report on everything that we have done since we started which will go to Finance and then will come here. A lot of people have got to have sign off. I am talking at the moment to Chris [Boothman] and it will go to the Committee etc etc.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Great. Good work. Anything else? No? OK. Thank you very much. See you on the last Thursday in June 2011. Please do let us know, well beforehand, if you are unhappy with your Committee involvement so that we can do some Kissinger shuttle diplomacy to sort it out. Thank you.

The meeting closed at 12.36pm.